

act done or omitted to be done in good faith in accordance with or in conformity with any order or judgment of a court made pursuant to any provision of this act.

Sec. 5. For the purposes of this act, the term "person" includes any individual, partnership, firm, corporation, association, or other organization, or the legal representative of any of the foregoing.

Sec. 6. If any provision of this act or the application thereof to any person or circumstance shall be held invalid, the remainder of this act and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide for suspending the enforcement of certain obligations against the operators of mines who are forced to cease operations because of the war."

#### ORDER AUTHORIZING THE SIGNING OF BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the forthcoming recess of the Senate the Presiding Officer of the Senate may have authority to sign bills or resolutions ready for signature.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HATCH in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

#### EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. KILGORE, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

Sundry nominations under the War Manpower Commission; and

Sundry officers for appointment, by transfer and/or promotion, in the Regular Army under the provisions of law.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the calendar.

#### COLLECTORS OF INTERNAL REVENUE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Harry C. Westover to be collector of internal revenue for the sixth district of California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed. The legislative clerk read the nomination of Norman Collison to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Delaware.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

#### POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. HILL. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc. That completes the Executive Calendar.

Mr. HILL. I ask unanimous consent that the President may be notified forthwith of all confirmations of today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified of all confirmations of today.

#### RECESS TO TUESDAY

Mr. HILL. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Tuesday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 4 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Tuesday, June 22, 1943, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 18 (legislative day of May 24), 1943:

##### ASSISTANT COMMISSIONERS OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Norman D. Cann, of Atlanta, Ga., to be Assistant Commissioner of Internal Revenue, to fill a newly created position.

Harold N. Graves, of Jacksonville, Ill., to be Assistant Commissioner of Internal Revenue, to fill a newly created position.

##### REGISTER OF LAND OFFICE

Mrs. Jessie M. Gardner, of Colorado, to be register of the Land Office at Denver, Colo. (reappointment).

##### WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

Francis L. McNamee, from the State of Pennsylvania, to be regional manpower director, at \$8,000 per annum, in the Philadelphia regional office.

Percy D. Fahnestock, from the State of Ohio, to be regional information specialist, at \$5,600 per annum, in the Cleveland regional office.

Guy A. Whitcomb, from the State of Ohio, to be senior manpower utilization consultant, at \$4,600 per annum, in the Cleveland regional office.

#### CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 18 (legislative day of May 24), 1943:

##### COLLECTORS OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Harry C. Westover to be collector of internal revenue for the sixth district of California.

Norman Collison to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Delaware.

##### POSTMASTERS

###### IOWA

Lewis M. Adams, Buffalo.  
Bess B. Gorham, Pisgah.

###### NEW JERSEY

Ethel H. McDonald, Englishtown.  
Henry N. McKay, Haddon Heights.  
C. Melvin Johnson, Jr., Highlands.  
Thomas Whittington, Sea Isle City.

Thomas H. Hall, Vineland.  
Clara Katz, Woodbine.

###### NORTH DAKOTA

Nicholas J. Krebsbach, Velva.

###### SOUTH DAKOTA

George E. Hagen, Armour.

George B. Brown, Clark.

Nicholas W. Tobin, Wentworth.

###### TEXAS

Hilmar H. Wagner, Rowena.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, JUNE 18, 1943

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

All glory be unto Thee, O Lord, Most High, Thy boundless love and mercy resist all definition. We thank Thee that Thou dost stoop to our needs and failings and fold us in the embrace of a Father's care. We walk Thy earth and are cheered by the presence of Thy power and beauty. Accept our praise for the ministry of Thy service and for the wonderful providence with which Thou dost surround us. Stay our footfall that we may ever listen to wise public opinion, to the maxims and the restraints which form the unwritten code of public welfare. We pray for prudence where we cannot see our path, to avoid danger, to heed the warning of wisdom, and may we realize and enjoy the treasures of the soul which enrich human life.

Our country, may we never fail her; stored with education, wealth, and opportunity, do Thou fortify us with the spirit of self-abandonment, with fortitude of soul that it shall never be proclaimed of us that we are false to our great trust or untrue to our obligations. Blessed Lord God, let it never be said that the purpose of today will be the folly and the error of tomorrow. In our dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On June 10, 1943:

H. R. 1670. An act to amend section 2 of the Civilian Pilot Training Act of 1939, as amended.

On June 14, 1943:

H. R. 2753. An act making supplemental appropriations to carry out the provisions of an act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941, as amended, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 133. Joint resolution to permit additional sales of wheat for feed.

On June 15, 1943:

H. R. 1258. An act to name certain locks in the St. Marys River at the falls, Michigan;

H. R. 2584. An act to abolish certain naval trust funds and deposits thereon, and to simplify naval accounting procedure, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 2664. An act to provide for the training of nurses for the armed forces, governmental and civilian hospitals, health agencies, and war industries, through grants to institutions providing such training, and for other purposes.

On June 17, 1943:

H. R. 1563. An act authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain auxiliary vessels for the United States Navy, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1403. An act to authorize the acquisition, improvement, and maintenance of the Gulf County Canal, Fla.; and

H. J. Res. 134. Joint resolution to continue the temporary increases in postal rates on first-class matter, and for other purposes.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a number of communications I have received from educational institutions favoring the continuance of the National Youth Administration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?  
There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from Paul McNutt regarding the reduction of personnel.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?  
There was no objection.

#### THE FARM PROGRAM

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and include a letter from Ferdie Deering, acting editor of the Farmer-Stockman, of Oklahoma City, Okla., addressed to Mr. Chester Davis.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?  
There was no objection.

[Mr. STEWART addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

#### AMENDMENT TO SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. JEFFREY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?  
There was no objection.

Mr. JEFFREY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call the attention of the Members of the House to a bill which I introduced yesterday as an amendment to the Social Security Act to preserve Federal old-age and survivors insurance benefit rights of members of the armed forces during the present war.

Under the existing provisions of the Social Security Act, the present rights of those who are inducted or who enlist in the armed services of the Nation may very well be lost solely through lapse of time.

The proposed amendment is very simple and freezes these rights of all persons in the armed services after December 6, 1941. The need for such an amendment was recognized by the administration when the Selective Service Act was passed.

In justice to the men and women serving the Nation today, this proposal merits prompt attention.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article I wrote for the Hearst papers, published last Sunday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?  
There was no objection.

#### ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and extend my remarks in the RECORD by the inclusion of a copy of a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?  
There was no objection.

[Mr. KEEFE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Frank C. Waldrop in the Times-Herald, of Washington, June 16, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?  
There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by Dr. Paul Haensel, formerly of the Northwestern University, on the subject of the Spending Tax versus the Sales Tax.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?  
There was no objection.

#### THE LATE HON. THOMAS R. BALL

Mr. McWILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McWILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I have just learned of the passing of the late Congressman Thomas R. Ball, who represented my district, the Second District of Connecticut, a couple of sessions ago. I feel it incumbent upon me to inform my colleagues of this sad event.

I knew ex-Congressman Ball very intimately. All his friends knew him as "Tommy." He was always conscientious, was a hard worker, and was an asset to our district. I am sure my colleagues will join in conveying to Mrs. Ball and to his family our heartfelt sympathy. I know that he will be missed not only in his home town, but in the district and the State. His passing is a loss to the entire country.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, all of us are saddened by the announcement of the death of our former colleague from Connecticut, Thomas R. Ball.

"Tommy" Ball served with us as a Member of the Seventy-sixth Congress. He was one of four freshmen Congressmen from Connecticut who took the oath of office January 2, 1939. Since then two of those men, Dr. Albert E. Austin and Thomas R. Ball, have answered their final roll call and have gone on to the upper body to join their loved ones and their friends in the Great Beyond.

Tommy Ball was a faithful, hard-working representative of his constituents. He came here with the background of 10 years' service in the Connecticut General Assembly. He was particularly farsighted in foreign relations. Long before many of his colleagues saw the need of this country's entering the present World War, Tommy Ball was urging our active participation in the fight against the Axis Powers.

Following his defeat in 1940, our former colleague accepted a position with the Ship & Engine Co., of Groton, Conn. With this concern he put his every energy into the task of turning out badly needed submarines.

He was happy because he knew that in his work he was doing his part in the Nation's effort to bring about victory.

Connecticut has lost a fine public servant and the Nation has lost a loyal, patriotic citizen.

I join with the membership of the House in expressing our sorrow to his widow and to his young daughter.

Mr. MONKIEWICZ. Mr. Speaker, it is with much grief that I rise to express my affection for one whom I respected very much. The sudden passing of the Honorable Thomas R. Ball, a former Member of Congress who represented the Second District from Connecticut during the seventy-sixth session of Congress, was a shock to all of us who know him.

I became attached to him during our service in the House of Representatives. He was a conscientious representative of the people at all times, loyal to his constituents, and sensitive to his responsibilities. He had a wide friendship in the House of Representatives.

His public service as a first selectman of the town of Old Lyme and later on as a representative in the general assembly from his community earned for him the respect and the admiration of the people of the State of Connecticut.

Tommie, as we all affectionately called him, was always polite, even under most stressing circumstances. Always gentle, he was nevertheless firm in his efforts in behalf of the principles for which he stood. As an architect by profession, he attained success in his vocation.

We all join in sympathy with his beloved wife and daughter.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the RECORD a short telegram on the food situation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?  
There was no objection.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include letters to Senator Robert L. Owen on the formation and utilization of his global alphabet.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?  
There was no objection.

#### CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum present.



Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 101]

|                 |                |                |
|-----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Baldwin, Md.    | Gale           | Merrow         |
| Baldwin, N. Y.  | Gallagher      | Morrison, La.  |
| Barden          | Gamble         | Mundt          |
| Barry           | Gifford        | Murphy         |
| Bell            | Gillie         | Murray, Tenn.  |
| Bradley, Mich.  | Gore           | O'Brien, N. Y. |
| Buckley         | Gossett        | O'Leary        |
| Burchill, N. Y. | Green          | O'Toole        |
| Burdick         | Hall           | Pace           |
| Byrne           | Edwin Arthur   | Pfeifer        |
| Cannon, Fla.    | Hancock        | Pracht         |
| Capozzoli       | Hart           | Price          |
| Carlson, Kans.  | Heffernan      | Reed, Ill.     |
| Chapman         | Hendricks      | Rizley         |
| Cochran         | Hoffman        | Sabath         |
| Costello        | Jarman         | Sheridan       |
| Courtney        | Johnson, Okla. | Simpson, Ill.  |
| Cox             | Johnson, Ward  | Slaughter      |
| Crawford        | Kean           | Smith, W. Va.  |
| Culkin          | Kennedy        | Somers, N. Y.  |
| Curley          | Keogh          | Stearns, N. H. |
| Dickstein       | King           | Sumners, Tex.  |
| Dies            | Kleberg        | Taylor         |
| Domeneaux       | Klein          | Tolan          |
| Douglas         | LeCompte       | Treadway       |
| Eberharter      | Lesinski       | Van Zandt      |
| Ellis           | Luce           | Vinson, Ga.    |
| Ellsworth       | McGehee        | Vursell        |
| Fay             | McLean         | Wadsworth      |
| Fellows         | Marcantonio    | Weiss          |
| Fish            | Mason          | White          |
| Forand          | May            | Winter         |
| Ford            | Merritt        | Zimmerman      |

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and thirty-three Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings, under the call, were dispensed with.

#### MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1944

Mr. SNYDER, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 2996, Rept. No. 566), making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, which was read a first and second time, and with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. ENGEL reserved all points of order on the bill.

#### ELECTION TO STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 265), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That ARTHUR G. KLEIN be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the Committee on Labor.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 266), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That THOMAS G. ABERNETHY be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution (H. Res. 267), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the Committee on the Library.

The resolution was agreed to.

#### CONSENTING TO COMPACT ENTERED BY IOWA AND NEBRASKA ESTABLISHING THE BOUNDARY LINE

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 2794) to approve and consent to the compact entered into by Iowa and Nebraska establishing the boundary between Iowa and Nebraska.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this the bill that was reported unanimously by the Committee on the Judiciary?

Mr. GWYNNE. Yes; it is.

Mr. WALTER. Will the gentleman make a brief explanation as to what the bill provides?

Mr. GWYNNE. The bill simply provides congressional approval of a compact entered into between the legislatures of the States of Iowa and Nebraska fixing the boundary line between those two States.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, has the gentleman consulted with the majority members of the committee?

Mr. GWYNNE. Yes. The bill was unanimously reported by the committee.

Mr. SPRINGER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, this is a bill that was reported out of the Committee on the Judiciary unanimously?

Mr. GWYNNE. That is correct.

Mr. SPRINGER. Has an act been passed by each of the States involved in this matter, approving the boundary line?

Mr. GWYNNE. It has.

Mr. SPRINGER. And this is merely a confirmation of the compact?

Mr. GWYNNE. The gentleman is correct.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the approval and consent of the Congress is hereby given to the compact effected by an act enacted by the Legislature of the State of Iowa entitled "An act to establish the boundary line between Iowa and Nebraska by agreement; to cede to Nebraska and to relinquish jurisdiction over lands now in Iowa but lying westerly of said boundary line and contiguous to lands in Nebraska; to provide that the provisions of this act become effective upon the enactment of a similar and reciprocal law by Nebraska and the approval of and consent to the compact thereby effected by the Congress of the United States of America and to declare an emergency," approved April 15, 1943 (House File 437, acts of the Fiftieth General Assembly), and the similar and reciprocal act enacted by the State of Nebraska entitled "A bill for an act to establish the boundary line between Iowa and Nebraska by agreement; to cede to Iowa and to relinquish jurisdiction over lands now in Nebraska but lying easterly of said boundary line and contiguous to lands in Iowa; to provide that the provisions of this act shall become effective upon the approval of and consent of the Congress of the United States of America to the compact effected by this act and House File 437 of the 1943 session of the Iowa Legislature; to repeal chapter 121, Session Laws of Nebraska, 1941; and to

declare an emergency," approved May 7, 1943 (Legislative bill 438, fifty-sixth session of the Nebraska State Legislature).

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### APPROPRIATION FOR WAR AGENCIES IN THE EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, 1944

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 2968) making appropriations for war agencies in the executive office of the President for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 2968), with Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I would like to call the attention of the members of the Committee to the fact that our program is to complete this bill tonight and to take up tomorrow the military appropriation bill and dispose of it before adjournment tomorrow. In this program we have the concurrence of all members of the Committee on both sides of the aisle and I trust we will have the cooperation of Members to get these two bills over to the Senate by the end of the week.

With the passage of the Military Establishment's appropriation bill tomorrow we will have completed and submitted to the Senate all of the annual supply bills. So far as the Committee on Appropriations is concerned, there will be only one more bill, a short deficiency appropriation bill, to take care of a few odds and ends, before recess.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. Is it not the understanding that if there should be a roll call on the War Department appropriation bill that the roll call will go over until Monday?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. We expect to complete the reading of the bill for amendments tomorrow.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. In order that the House will understand thoroughly and so that no one will get away without having it fully in mind, the idea of not having a controversial roll call tomorrow is dependent upon completing this bill presently under consideration tonight; is that not correct?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is correct; we must complete this bill tonight in order to take up the Military Establishment appropriation bill tomorrow.

Mr. TABER. And everyone must stay here until we get the bill through.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. And stay here tomorrow until we also get the Military Establishment appropriation bill through. With these two bills out of the way, we will have completed the appropriation program and, as soon as conference reports are agreed to, will be ready to recess at any time after the 1st of July.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. I do not think it is clearly understood yet, I will say to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], that if there is to be a roll call on the bill to be considered tomorrow that roll call will not go over until Monday?

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. I notice there has been a little conference on the other side and I would like to have a final statement from the chairman of the Appropriations Committee as to the intention of completing the military appropriation bill tomorrow.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding of the situation, which I think has been more or less ironed out, that there is not to be a roll call on this bill, the war appropriations bill, tomorrow, and that if the bill is taken up and considered a roll call will take place on Monday?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. But that could not be accomplished, on the other hand, if this bill that is now pending is carried over.

Mr. McCORMACK. If this bill is carried over it is my personal opinion it should be disposed of.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, let me say, after conference with members of the Committee on Appropriations on both sides of the House, our program is to complete this bill today and we hope the members of the committee will stay with us tonight and help us pass it and send it to the Senate.

Then on tomorrow we hope to take up the military establishments appropriation bill and complete the reading for amendment.

If there is a roll call on the military establishment bill it will go over until Monday.

Mr. RABAUT. But there will be a roll call on this bill?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. There will be a roll call on the pending bill before adjournment.

Mr. RABAUT. When?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. We hope to complete the bill and vote on it tonight.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, before we start reading the bill for amendment, not having taken any time under general debate, I want to take just a few minutes hastily to review the situation that confronts us as we consider a bill certain portions of which in my judgment are as vitally necessary to the war effort as the War Department appropriation bill which we shall take up tomorrow and which will probably pass without amendments.

We have to remember that this war is being fought not only with airplanes and tanks on the foreign battlefield, but that the effort to preserve our freedom and our way of life, to win this war and to overcome our enemies, extends in the foreign fields way beyond the battle line across into enemy territory, and on the home front into every realm of our civil life. The appropriations contained in this bill touch those features of our war effort.

The subcommittee that considered this bill spent long days and long tedious hours hearing the testimony. There are two volumes of testimony containing something like 2,100 or 2,200 pages. In addition to that there were probably another 400 or 500 pages of testimony that had to be off the record because of its highly secret nature. Those were not perfunctory hearings where some member of the committee half asleep would sit there and permit some departmental head to read a prepared speech and insert a lot of stuff in the record. Turn to it; you will see that the members of the committee carefully, conscientiously, and painstakingly inquired into these activities. As a result we bring you here a bill with a unanimous report of the committee, and insofar as the amount of money appropriated in the bill is concerned the figures have been unanimously agreed to by the committee, the minority as well as the majority—with the exception of the Board of Economic Warfare. Let me repeat that if you will, and remember, this committee, the majority and the distinguished, able, and energetic minority—

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. I wish to state that there was no agreement whatever upon the Board of Economic Warfare.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I so stated; I excepted the Board of Economic Warfare.

Mr. TABER. It was as to amounts. There will be some restrictive amendments offered.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I said as to the amounts appropriated with the exception of the Board of Economic Warfare the committee had a meeting of minds. In doing that concessions were made on both sides of the committee.

Two or three of these activities I think have been cut dangerously low. The Office of Civilian Defense, in my opinion, has been scuttled, practically; I doubt if some of its important functions can be

continued; and yet I am going to fulfill my agreement with my committee and resist any increase of appropriations. I am going to stand by my agreement with the committee and resist any increase of appropriations for O. W. I., although I believe in some of their activities, especially in their foreign service, where we cut them below what they had this year although our armies are now on the march and the need for this service, we are told by the General Staff, is greater than ever. I am going to resist increases, as I shall expect the other members of the committee to resist further cuts in this bill.

We have cut \$139,000,000 out of this bill and it has been done by making concessions on both sides. I know perfectly well that no agreement I might make in the subcommittee, or any of my colleagues might make, could bind any gentleman in this House. You can offer an amendment to cut or any amendment to increase. I have no peculiar ability to pass on this any more than you would have except such information as has come to me because I sat through these hearings. Any other committee of the House of the same number of men could do as good a job and perhaps a better job, but the fact remains that the subcommittee having consideration of it has gone through it carefully and painstakingly and has had a meeting of minds. I hope it will be the pleasure of this House when it comes to considering these amendments to keep this fact in mind.

Every Member of the House can get up in the well of the House and criticize O. P. A., O. W. I., and a lot of these other agencies. There are things every one of them do that we do not like, that we could denounce, that we would like to change. I have no objection to that; I think perhaps some good comes from constructive criticism when it is not partisan and when it is not bitter, and when it is not destructive.

In the first place the O. P. A. is just getting started under its new management, Prentiss Brown. Let us give him a chance. The first thing Prentiss Brown did as O. P. A. Administrator was to say to Congress:

Although you invited me to come back for \$20,000,000 additional funds I am not going to; forget it; I will wait until the bill comes up.

The bill came up to us and we cut that appropriation for O. P. A. \$12,335,000. We denied them 1,900 new investigators that they wanted; we denied them 1,235 other employees they wanted. We went even further, we said:

In your office staff in Washington you have too many employees; you must reduce them by 412 below your present level.

That is what we did to O. P. A.; we have made a drastic cut notwithstanding the fact they told us there were eight rationing programs coming up in this next year. Now, of course, if the Congress wants to say as I have heard some Members say that we should disband it all and let it go to hell—that is one way to do it, that is one way to do it if you want to. Throw all the control of prices and rationing overboard, if you wish, and see what you bring down upon the head of



this Nation, see what your money will be worth, see what your savings bonds will be worth. You cannot reform O. P. A. by cutting its funds. I think we have cut them pretty heavy. Perhaps they should have had some of these people to go out into the field to investigate some of these black-market operations.

The Office of Civilian Defense got a bad name here because of the fan dancers and one thing and another. If you give a dog a bad name he never gets over it. They asked the Budget Bureau for \$9,000,000 for their activities. The Budget cut them to \$5,000,000 and our committee cut them to \$4,000,000. I think we cut them too much although I am going to resist any attempt to increase it because I had an agreement in my committee. We did cut them too much. Under this cut I do not believe it will be possible for the Office of Civilian Defense to carry on their operations with the voluntary groups all over the country. All they will be able to do is to carry on their operations with the air-raid wardens and that type of operations.

Mr. Chairman, I would like for the Members to read the report on this before they vote.

The O. W. I. asked for \$47,000,000. We cut \$12,000,000 off of that request. We cut \$5,000,000 off of an emergency fund that they asked. We cut \$4,000,000 off of their overseas branch which I think was a dangerous cut. We cut \$3,000,000 off of the domestic branch about which there has been so much criticism. We made a drastic cut there.

Next is the Board of Economic Warfare. I do not have time to take it up in detail. My time is practically up now, but I would ask the members of the committee, and I believe this is a reasonable request, to turn to the report of the committee, page 4. There are two or three pages describing the Board of Economic Warfare there. Read it, if you will. I ask you all to read it. I hope when you come to consider this that the Members of the House will consider the fact that the committee has earnestly tried to bring them a bill that is satisfactory and I hope you will take it into consideration and give it some regard and respect before you vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is true that the members of the subcommittee did reach an agreement as to the amount of these appropriations that they would recommend, with the exception of the Board of Economic Warfare. I am not going to discuss that now, because just as soon as the paragraph is read I intend to offer an amendment to cut it and the argument that I shall make in favor of the cut is absolutely irrefutable.

There was a dispute in the committee as to almost every item. There were many of us who wanted to cut more off the Office of Price Administration. If they had an efficient set-up in Washington they could stand a cut of a million dollars upon their departmental

set-up beyond what was given them without hurting them a bit and at the same time improve the tone of their work. There is no question about that. On the other hand, I shall vote as I agreed.

In connection with the Office of Strategic Services there was a cut and, frankly, that was the only cut that I hated to see because it is the only outfit of those that are being presented to you here that is really contributing a major item toward the war effort.

The Office of Civilian Defense was not cut on any of the items where it is performing a real service such as the service which relates to civilian protection and whatever work might be done for the protection of our communities against air raids and sabotage. The things that were cut were the things that it is not supposed to do. Frankly, the cuts there were not as big as they should be for the good of that service.

We come now to O. W. I., which puts out the most ridiculous kind of propaganda and is loaded up with the worst kind of derelicts. There were 417 foreigners in the office in New York, some of whom were removed after the hearings, these people being employed without the slightest regard for the Federal Treasury or the effectiveness of the O. W. I. in the war effort. Frankly, we did not cut that outfit as much as it should be cut, but we did cut it \$12,000,000 and that is better than no cut at all. That is about a 33-percent cut in the activities outside of the secret activities that we did appropriate for.

The other cuts were very nominal. Anyone in the House, be he on the majority side or the minority side, who thinks that we should go further has the perfect right to offer an amendment, and I hope that if anyone feels that he should offer an amendment he will do so. Of course, I shall stand by the bargain I made with the committee and I shall vote with my committee on those things to which I agreed. There never could be any question of that. When I make a bargain I live up to it.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. If we prolong the life of this O. P. A. for another year, that prevents us bringing in from the Banking and Currency Committee a substitute plan that would put other people in charge under a more workable theory of price control. I do not think this country can stand to have its supply line, its processing, producing, and distributing systems destroyed one after another at a time when we need these essential foods and goods.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I do not think anything should prevent the Com-

mittee on Banking and Currency from bringing in a bill which will clear up this situation. It was intimated to us yesterday by the majority leader that we were going to be rid of the long-haired professors over in the O. P. A. and that practical people of business experience and character were going to take their places. I am hopeful that the suggestion the majority leader made to us may be realized. I do not think that in wartime I could dare to vote to wipe out the Office of Price Administration appropriation. I do think that I should, as I did yesterday, call attention to the fact that America is facing starvation next winter unless the Office of Price Administration and the Office of Food Administration are run with an appreciation of the problems that are before them, and unless we have competent people to pass on these questions. I think that absolutely must and should be done.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words, and ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, my good friend from Virginia has raised a question which I think merits an answer at this stage of the proceedings. I entertain a high regard for him and for the impressive contributions he has made to good government. I think he struck the key today when he said, "Can you reform an agency by reducing its appropriations?" His answer would be in the negative. My answer would be in the affirmative, and I propose to establish it if I can.

When we get to the Office of Price Administration I shall offer an amendment to reduce the amount in the bill by \$35,000,000. This represents \$22,500,000 which they are asking for over and above the current fiscal year appropriation for local offices, and about \$13,000,000 over and above the fiscal year appropriation that they are asking for full-time personnel for the Washington office, for the 9 regional offices, for 108 district offices, and for 279 rental offices.

They had 4,600 people in Washington in 1942 and 5,063 in 1943. Their budget request was for 5,414 in the Washington office. Their budget request and as provided by the committee would include an over-all staff of 65,607 persons.

This is what they have had in the Washington office, among others: They have 191 accountants; they have 798 business specialists; they have 165 analysts; they have 896 economists; they have 394 attorneys; they have 170 statisticians; and then they have had some 2,100 or 2,200 clerks, clerk-typists, and clerk-stenographers.

Let us see how it works and why I believe you can reform an agency by reducing its appropriation substantially. This I give to you from House Document 891 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, which is the O. P. A. report for

the period from May 1 to July 31, 1942. You have to dig it out, but here it is.

They received a little over 4,500 complaints over that period; 185 were dismissed; 193 were settled without investigation; 110 were otherwise disposed of; 4,060 complaints were referred for investigation; 1,556 of those were completed, and then they were referred to the Washington office for review. What happened to these 1,556 complaints? Eight hundred and eighty-nine were closed, showing that there was no violation whatever.

What is the conclusion from these figures? First of all, there was no violation shown in 75 percent of the cases that were referred to the Washington office. This indicates that too many complaints are being investigated. It means that a good sifting job on the complaint is not being done in the local, in the area, and in the State and regional offices. If there were a better sifting of complaints you would not need so many clerks and stenographers, you would not need so many attorneys, you would not need so many enforcement personnel in Washington, and, for that matter, in the regional and in the State offices. In addition, you could substantially reduce the number of investigators.

What is the course of one of these complaints? Assume that John Brown runs a grocery store in Johnson Center. It is complained that he sold baked beans in excess of the ceiling price. An investigator is assigned. He covers the case and he makes a report to his immediate superior. Then what? Copies are made and filed here, there, and everywhere. Then it is referred to the State office for checking and rechecking. Then the report is referred to the regional office for checking and for re-checking. Then it goes to the national office, and it is handled at three or four levels in the Washington office.

There are many copies. They have their files so cluttered up with useless forms, with useless complaints, with useless copies of letters, that that is the reason they have to have such a huge staff of clerks, stenographers, and everybody else to handle this tidal wave of literature that washes through the regional offices and the Washington office.

Then it enters into their statistical picture. They have in Washington at the present time 170 statisticians. They get busy and assemble all this information, whether or not it is useful, and then place it into some kind of a report; and they must have clerks, they must have stenographers to provide the country with a variety of statistics and literature.

If there were careful sifting, if they did not bother so much about the little fellow, who seldom willfully violates one of these regulations, you could dispose of \$35,000,000 worth of personnel in O. P. A. at the present time. The record will show that 88 out of every 100 complaints have been investigated. It cannot stand up in the light of good administrative procedure in Government or in business, and it indicates the inefficiency of the O. P. A. technique at the present time.

We had better cut and reform this agency by reducing its expenditures and

get rid of some of the personnel that they are going to put out on the country. It is purely a question of lack of good, sound, efficient administrative technique. Prentiss Brown can get along with the money when we cut the \$35,000,000. I entertain a real affection for Prentiss Brown. I served for many years with him on the Committee on Banking and Currency of this House. I think he is a fine, able gentleman. But that does not make any excuse for or serve as an extenuation of a faulty technique in O. P. A. I am of opinion, since they have developed so much friction in the country, and have become a focal point of complaint from people everywhere, that it is our responsibility to cut this by \$35,000,000. There are some who would cut it even more, but I shall be content to take out the extra money they are asking for the local offices, for an increase in the Washington, the regional and the area offices, and I believe it is fully justified. It still leaves \$10,000,000 more than the amount provided for the fiscal year 1943.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. They are fundamentally going to do that from now on, and worse, because they are trying to control the luxuries, and they ought to boil down to the fact that we can only afford to control the things that are absolutely necessary to keep this country in good health and fit to fight and win the war.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think much may be said on that subject. The question is whether or not \$130,000,000 will be sufficient for the next fiscal year to do this job. My answer, then, to the question of whether you can reform an agency by substantially reducing its personnel and its administration centers is emphatically "Yes."

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. HINSHAW. Did the gentleman's committee—

Mr. DIRKSEN. I might clarify the matter first by saying that I am not on the deficiency subcommittee.

Mr. HINSHAW. Then the gentleman has made a personal investigation?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. HINSHAW. Does the gentleman find any inefficiency due to the fact that a large proportion of their personnel there consists of volunteers?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I did not go into that phase of it, but I think there we run into another question, and that is the administrative competency of those who are in the area, in the regional offices, and those who have to do with the supervision of the field services here in Washington, and that, of course, I shall cover by another amendment.

Mr. HINSHAW. If the gentleman will permit another observation, I made some investigation myself when home recently concerning the difficulties in the home field, due to the fact that the personnel there was so largely of a volunteer nature. They would work a few hours this week and a few hours next week, and then somebody else would take the job,

and the net result was total confusion in the field offices.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The answer is that they are paying so much attention to details that they have lost sight of the larger issue, and that accounts in large measure for recruiting unnecessary workers in many cases, and contributing to the confusion.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment. For reasons already stated, I think the O. P. A. has done more harm than good, and I think we have reason to think they are going to do worse in the future. I think that the time will come when the O. P. A. will go down in history like the walls of Jericho, and for the same reason, because there is so much complaint. Look at this roll-back and this subsidy program that they are contemplating. Of course, it is inflationary. The roll-back is the O. P. A.'s Ruml plan. It provides that the grocery bills you incur today shall be paid later by the returning soldiers and other future taxpayers. Of course, it is inflationary, but that is not the worst trouble with it. You already have seen three examples of roll-back—butter, the canning industry, and meat. You already know that the worst vice of it is that it is cutting production, and the question here today, as I see it, is whether we will have to force our people to support this unworkable policy administered by people who do not know what they should know about industries, and go on until the people learn by sad experience that governments can always create money and fill the people's pockets with money, and at the same time they may grow hungrier and hungrier, because you cannot eat money.

Representatives of the butter industry came here and showed the O. P. A. why, in their experienced judgment, a 5-cent roll-back on butter would be sure to cause a decrease in the production on the part of the farmers. The O. P. A. said, "We have already decided the policy." The canners came down here, and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD bulges with their complaints. You are not likely to hear much from the canners in the future. They are likely to be mute, because the newspapers announced that the O. P. A. would decide in the future which canners would have to take the roll-back out of their profits, or which canners would get a subsidy from the Government. That, you will be quick to see, is a political ax over their heads, and yet they already have reduced the acreage in canned vegetables and they already contemplate more reduction in acreage. Worst of all, in my opinion, is the meat program. I have been investigating the fact that for the first time in our country we do not have a differential between the price of finished cattle that have always been fed on the range and then brought to the midwestern plains, shipped there, and fattened there, and then shipped to the market—investigating as to why it should be eliminated by the O. P. A.

I discovered that it was the deliberate intention of O. P. A. to eliminate our



feeder industry and to ship the cattle straight from the range. What you get when you buy meat when it grows straight from the range to market is just hides, horns, hoofs, and bones. Those cattle, if I may use the vocabulary of the cattle country, when they come to our midwestern plains, take up feed that would otherwise be wasted and bring it to you and your people in the shape of food. Cattle are fed not merely corn. They also get foodstuffs that would otherwise be wasted, our grass, our hay that dairy cattle cannot eat, our green corn, and so forth. On account of the floods this year there will be a lot of green corn that we cannot harvest because we have gotten into the fields 30 days too late. It will be wasted unless we can send it to you in the form of beef and hogs. The hogs follow behind the cattle and we do not have to feed the hogs half as much as we would otherwise feed them if they could not follow the cattle. What happens? Here comes the O. P. A., as I discovered in the hearings on the Commodity Credit Corporation bill, and says, "We do not want to have the midwestern farmers feed the cattle, because we think it is a waste of grain."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. The O. P. A. has said, "We want to change the feeding habits of America, because other nations have changed their feeding habits and feed our people grain and beans and soya beans instead of meat." I want you to ask your wives whether you can do as well without meat. I want you to appreciate before you prolong the longevity of this O. P. A. that it is cutting the processors and producers and distributors of this Nation and cutting down the supply of food. I want you to stop and think whether you want to send soldiers out to fight and men out to work to win the war on the same kind of a skimpy meatless diet that the Japanese eat. To me this is a very serious question. These O. P. A. professor-politicians are perhaps learned in their own fields, but when it comes to being dictators of all kinds of business about which they have no practical knowledge and when they are not willing to listen to those who do know what they are talking about, to me they are like the "physicians of no value" who came to Job in his day of trial to comfort him with platitudinous fallacies, for that is all they are using in the O. P. A.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last five words just to sound one note of encouragement in the House. I am deeply gratified to be able to report that the contract whereby the Standard Oil Co. would have gained complete control of the oil in the naval oil reserve at Elk Hills, Calif., has been canceled, and it is a matter of profound satisfaction to me

to realize that I brought that matter to the attention of the House on Friday, May 21, protested then against the contract, and called for a thorough investigation thereof.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last five words.

If I may make bold to address my remarks to the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], who spoke about reduction in the Budget of O. P. A., I think we can all agree that much of those expenses arise from various intricate and often incomprehensible rules and regulations that require a great deal of work to even understand. I shall not discuss at the moment whether or not those regulations may be right and proper. I believe many of them are wrong. But I want to call attention to the fact that in the field offices under the local boards in your home town and my home town a great part of the help there is volunteer. I understand that much of this is brought in through the civilian defense organizations, but it is volunteer. Those people are doing a splendid job within their limitations. However, there are distinct limitations upon the fine people who come in to do these jobs. Most of them work a few hours a day, perhaps twice or three times a week, sometimes daily, attempting to solve a terrific organizational problem, but many of them are inexperienced in office work. I have had occasion to go into two of such offices in my home district, and in both cases the members of the board requested that they be given enough permanent help to do the work they are called upon to do, and said that if they had a little more permanent help they would not require nearly so many volunteers. That would mean a material lessening of both the amount of hours of work and the amount of confusion which occurs by reason of inexperienced personnel working at intervals.

I think we all want to compliment those who have volunteered their services, but I think every one of us can realize the difficulties that arise from a requirement for too much volunteer service on a strictly voluntary basis; that is, they come and go as they please. It brings about a serious discontinuity in office routine.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, while I believe that much of the effort of the O. P. A. could be properly eliminated by a change of attitude at the top by abandonment of many policies that only confuse, by the separation of social planners from the policy-making group in the core of O. P. A., and their replacement by sound-thinking, sane, and sensible people; nevertheless, until that millennium arrives, I favor supplying the local boards with sufficient trained personnel, on regular employment status, to properly do the routine work.

I was not in favor of that method of price control which was adopted in 1941, but favored the method proposed by Mr. Bernard Baruch, which was embodied in the Gore bill. But my ideas did not prevail at the time as only 65 votes could be mustered for the Gore bill. The Henderson bill was adopted and proved to be unworkable, just as was forecast. It

has since been amended and supplemented by other acts. But bad administration can ruin even the best-intentioned legislation. Sound administration can likewise overcome the shortcomings of poor legislation. The Price Control Act needs sound-thinking administrators, and we hope that Prentiss Brown may bring sanity to the O. P. A.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last 6 words.

The gentleman from Illinois [Miss SUMNER] has asked us to confer with our wives as to what has happened with reference to the O. P. A. I spoke to my wife the other day with reference to the rising costs of food. In making a comparison between the price of food today and as of last year, she complains bitterly. Consider that in March, this year, the cost of living was 22 percent above the level of January 1, 1941, the basic date of the Little Steel formula. As of mid-May, it is estimated at 24 percent above that level. Thus the wage-rate adjustments to 15 percent above that same level cannot hold without adequate price roll-back. How can they when bread has gone up 22 percent; butter, 69 percent; milk, 18 percent; oranges, 116 percent; cucumbers, 141 percent; green peppers, 275 percent, and potatoes up 219 percent.

With wages fixed for the average wage earner and the ordinary housewife with a narrow purse, limited by virtue of that fixation of wages, how a person can reach after all of these foodstuffs that have gone up so high is beyond comprehension. Drastic remedies are essential. Drastic remedies naturally cause reactions in our minds and in the minds of others, that are somewhat unpleasant.

But we cannot help ourselves. We are compelled to use the medium of the roll-back, and we cannot use the roll-back without the subsidy.

Unfortunately, I find a provision in this bill which ordinarily would be subject to a point of order, to the effect that the O. P. A. cannot use any appropriation herein provided for purposes of subsidy, and, furthermore, I understand amendments will be offered to the effect that no funds may be used which are appropriated under this bill, for the purpose of administering subsidies that may be utilized through any other agency like R. F. C. or Commodity Credit Corporation.

The R. F. C. has the right, under the Price Control Act, under the authority of the President, to accord subsidies in the case of critical and strategic materials. Thus an attempt will be made in an appropriation bill to legislate, and unfortunately all points of order are waived, otherwise we would knock those attempted amendments into a cocked hat by making appropriate points of order.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. If I understand the rule correctly, it merely waives point of order against the bill as reported, but the rule

does not waive points of order against amendments that may be offered to the bill.

Mr. CELLER. I hope we can get the aid of the gentleman from South Dakota in that respect so as to be able to sustain points of order when they will be made against the amendments that would graft legislation upon this appropriation bill.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I take it for granted you believe in the Fair Labor Standards Act and in the Wage and Hour Division. I would just like to ask the gentleman from New York this question: Do you know, at the fixed price of 46 cents a pound on butter in Chicago, what return the man gets who milks the cow?

Mr. CELLER. I am not aware of that, but I will say this, that no man should be forced to operate at a loss and that, if we are compelled to roll back the prices, the processor, the farmer, the distributor, the retailer, and the wholesaler, I think, should be amply compensated so as to make up for that loss, so that the consumer ultimately, the wage earner ultimately, and the housewife ultimately can buy sustaining food, clothes, and medicine within the limited spending range of those whose wages are frozen.

Now with reference to subsidies, there is nothing novel about subsidies; it is not a new idea.

I hold before you a menu from the House Office restaurant. It contains various articles of food and delectable dishes—furnished us at most reasonable prices. Those prices charged us do not equal the cost of this food, its preparation, and its service. We pay the operating costs out of the contingent funds of the House. If that is not a subsidy, I do not know what a subsidy is. The prices charged us now over in the restaurant in the House and the lunchroom or cafeteria in the New House Office Building are noncommensurate with value received. Our meals are in part subsidized. Those eating places of ours are operating upon deficits which we make up by appropriation of the people's money. I give you some salient facts about our own food subsidy, as follows:

*House restaurant in Capitol and cafeteria in New House Office Building*

|  |          |
|--|----------|
| <b>Fiscal year 1940:</b>                                 |          |
| Receipts from operation.....                             | \$78,049 |
| Expenditures.....  | 108,685  |
| Deficiency provided through appropriation by Congress... | 30,636   |
| <b>Fiscal year 1941:</b>                                 |          |
| Receipts from operation.....                             | 89,104   |
| Expenditures.....  | 115,773  |
| Deficiency provided through appropriation by Congress... | 26,669   |
| <b>Fiscal year 1942:</b>                                 |          |
| Receipts from operation.....                             | 114,318  |
| Expenditures.....  | 137,034  |
| Deficiency provided through appropriation by Congress... | 22,716   |

**Fiscal year 1943 (first 10 months—July 1, 1942, to Apr. 30, 1943):**

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| Receipts from operation.....   | \$140,522 |
| Expenditures.....  | 156,970   |
| Deficiency provided through appropriation by Congress (10 months).....                           | 16,448    |
| Estimated amount to be met through appropriation for months of May and June 1943 (2 months)..... | 2,000     |
| Total deficiency met and to be met through appropriation by Congress (12 months)....             | 18,448    |

House restaurant was placed under Architect of Capitol October 1, 1940.

Cafeteria in New House Office Building was placed in operation Mar. 3, 1942.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I repeat, we can buy meals at the restaurant downstairs for 50 percent, and even less than that, of the price that we can get the same meals for elsewhere. If, therefore, we vote to give ourselves a food subsidy, we cannot refrain from according relief to the consumer who suffers immeasurably from high prices of food. There are some who partake of that subsidy and yet would deny that benefit to the housewives throughout the Nation.

That restaurant is run at an absolute loss, despite the fact that it has no light bills to pay, no rent to pay, no expense or outlay for linen or cleaning or repairs.

The same thing holds true as to the restaurant at the other end of the Capitol.

The persons who are bellyaching and carping about the subsidies are those who have been getting handouts all of these years. I refer to the farm bloc, I refer to the cattle bloc; and let me also remind the newspaper representatives up in that gallery that their publishers too are recipients of a gigantic mail subsidy. Most of the Republican newspapers are not in favor of subsidies; on the contrary they are opposed to subsidies, despite the fact that they themselves accept Government largesse.

Furthermore, subsidies are not something that have just arisen in this emergency. The whole Nation has been built up by virtue of subsidies. We built the transcontinental railroads with the use of subsidies; we built the canals with subsidies and, furthermore, our Government, even today, pays about \$700,000,000 a year to keep down canners' prices of vegetables, to pay rail charges on gasoline to the East and coal to New England, to hold the line on imported goods, and to keep high-cost mines operating, like silver and copper.

And what is the tariff but a subsidy? And among the items on which subsidies are being paid are machinery, mahogany, sugar, wheat for the alcohol program, vegetable oil, and cocoa.

Why, subsidies have been used from time immemorial and we must use them in connection with this roll-back program in order to take care of the great margin between the prices which are fixed for wages and the prices which are being charged all over the country for food and clothing and medicine.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MILLER of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I should like to call the attention of the House to the fact that Mr. Elmer Davis, chosen by the President to head the Office of War Information, is a sort of political weathervane blown hither and thither politically by every passing breeze, but strangely enough, always to the left. Indeed, he has frequently been left of the New Deal, and on one occasion supported Norman Thomas and was, for a while at least, a devout disciple of the philosophy of Karl Marx.

Now why do you suppose he was selected by the President to head this most important New Deal agency, created, of course, by Executive order? Was it because he was a highly paid radio commentator; or was it because of demonstrated executive abilities needed to handle a Government agency employing some 5,000 persons; or was it because of any superior talents as a newspaper man; or was it because it was felt by the President, and rightly so, that he would interpret the New Deal to the people of this Nation and to foreign countries as the President desired it interpreted?

Well, let us look at the record, as Al Smith would say, and see what are Mr. Davis' political antecedents. We find that in 1940 he was elected a member of the county committee of the American Labor Party in New York City, and in that position was active in its councils. We know, of course, that the American Labor Party in its leftist slant outdoes the New Deal; that, in fact, it was organized prior to the election of 1936 with the objective of forcing the New Deal to be even more radical than Mr. Roosevelt and its leaders generally at that time could stomach. We know also that this party is now being organized on a national basis to perpetuate the New Deal in power, and that at last accounts, although Mr. Davis has resigned from leadership of the party in New York, he is still an enrolled member.

Now how about the period preceding the last national election? Back in 1932 Mr. Davis wrote a letter to the New York Times in which he expressed preference for the National Socialist ticket, headed by Mr. Norman Thomas, over the Democratic ticket, headed by Mr. Roosevelt. Of course, the Socialist platform in contrast to the Democratic platform of that year, to which Mr. Roosevelt subscribed but never followed, was a radical one.

Said Mr. Davis in the letter to the Times I have mentioned:

Personally I prefer Norman Thomas to Mr. Roosevelt. \* \* \* And the Socialist program, not in its theories but as it would be realized in legislation and administration—to the democratic.

No, the blooming New Deal that had not yet uncovered its hand was too tame



for Mr. Davis' leftist tendencies and theories.

Again in 1932, Mr. Davis wrote another communication to the New York Times:

Those of you who are going to vote the Socialist ticket this fall are accused of lack of realism. Why vote for a man who will not be elected? Well, even if Mr. Thomas is not elected, the heavy vote for him will make both Republicans and Democrats realize that the people are concerned about other things than the distribution of the offices.

Also:

The development of the small Socialist Party of the past into a major organization is as big a job as the transformation of the Regular Army into the American Expeditionary Forces and that job must be started now.

Yes; Mr. Davis was a Socialist in that year, but in 1936 he was back in the New Deal, supporting Mr. Roosevelt for President. In 1937 he enrolled in the American Labor Party, but though he disapproved of the tactics used by Mr. Roosevelt in securing his third-term nomination in 1940, he is now both a Roosevelt administrator and a Roosevelt supporter.

How, with such a record of political activity, can Mr. Davis, even with the best of intentions, be an impartial, non-partisan director of the Government's several agencies dealing with all sources of public information, the press, radio, and moving pictures? And is it any wonder that the Office of War Information, insofar as its domestic activities are concerned, should be transformed into a Government propaganda agency developed along the lines of the dictator countries?

Will the American people continue to stand for such a situation, one that has necessarily undermined their confidence in the press and has caused them to regard askance the information imparted by the radio commentators, including Mr. Davis himself in his weekly broadcasts, and the propaganda that is being fed to them ad infinitum et ad nauseum by the movies?

Mr. Davis recently described talk of a fourth term as "hot air." That he is one of the architects actually engaged in fashioning a fourth term can scarcely be doubted. That he is working for the continuation of Mr. Roosevelt in office and for the perpetuation of the New Deal, rather than the giving of factual information to the American people, is clearly shown by his attack on the American press last Monday, and in which he rebuked the able, patriotic, and independent newspapermen of Washington for reporting things in the Capital as they saw them, rather than as he, Mr. Davis, would have them reported.

Are we to pass by without protest and continue the existence of a so-called information agency, masquerading as such when in fact it is a full-fledged propaganda agency; something the American people have always abhorred and regarded as contrary to American concepts and principles? Or are we to demand that the left wing political head of this agency, a radical zealot, be superseded by someone in whom the American peo-

ple can have trust and confidence and who will not betray that confidence by imposing upon them his own peculiar political beliefs?

I believe the time has come to investigate the Office of War Information; to clip its political wings, confine its activities to factual news reporting in accordance with the best American principles and traditions in this field.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a consent request?

Mr. FULMER. I yield.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, does that take care of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] who is seeking recognition?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I was hoping the gentleman would let us read part of the bill before we had further debate.

Mr. TABER. No; I think if the gentleman from South Carolina speaks the gentleman from Wisconsin should be given the opportunity also.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I modify my request and ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I have the high privilege and the great honor of presenting to you and the Members of the House the champion scrap gatherer of high school boys and girls, not only of South Carolina, but the champion for the United States.

I refer to Dial Rawl, of Gilbert, Lexington County, S. C., my district. This young man is occupying a seat at this time in the Members' Gallery.

I am delighted to have the privilege of presenting to you this high school boy, who, as stated, has won the national championship in the salvage drive held some time ago.

I want you, my colleagues, to know that I appreciate the fine applause which you have given this young man, to which he is entitled.

Dial Rawl is the son of a farmer residing on a farm in old Lexington County, a very important agricultural county in my district.

This young man is the type of millions of boys and girls whom we have on the farms in the rural areas in many States of the Union, that is, he is the type who will make good if given an opportunity and a fair chance.

During all of the years that I have served in the Congress of the United States I have in every instance not only given my unlimited time in trying to be of service to the great masses of the people but in being helpful to this type of young man, realizing the importance of trying to be of service to this great class

of people with the hope of giving to them an opportunity to make good.

I have helped a great many boys and girls secure positions with the Government, and I am proud of the fact that many of them have taken advantage of their positions and their environment in connection with their work, going to school and to college, equipping themselves so as to be able not only to make good in their various lines of work, but to be able to make for themselves a real name.

This young man has had a wonderful trip to Washington with expenses paid because of having won the national championship.

I am delighted that I have had the privilege of entertaining him, his father, and mother on this occasion.

I am attaching hereto a letter in connection with the winning of this national championship, which should be of interest:

COLUMBIA, S. C., June 3, 1943.

Mr. PAUL C. CABOT,  
Director, Salvage Division, General Salvage Branch, War Production Board,  
Washington, D. C.

(Attention Mr. Ray H. Haun.)

Subject: Dial Rawl, of Gilbert, Lexington County, S. C., national champion scrap collector for 1942.

DEAR SIR: The 1942 newspaper school salvage campaign held in South Carolina was won by a 13-year-old boy named Dial Rawl, of the Gilbert School in Lexington County, S. C. This boy, who was responsible for collecting 487.371 pounds of scrap, not only won top honors in South Carolina but for the whole United States as well, as per copy of letter enclosed from Mr. Ray H. Haun.

The South Carolina Press Association, who sponsored this campaign, offered as an additional award a trip to Washington and return, with all expenses paid.

Dial Rawl and his father and mother wish to leave Columbia Tuesday night, June 15, arriving in Washington Wednesday morning, and will spend Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday, June 16, 17, and 18, there, returning home Friday night, June 18.

Former State Secretary T. E. LaGrone, of the South Carolina State Salvage Committee, talked over long distance with your Mr. Haun and the latter offered to make hotel reservations in Washington, to have a car meet Dial Rawl upon his arrival in the city, and to conduct him on a tour of inspection of the points of interest around the National Capital.

This office would be glad to have this verbal understanding confirmed in order that there may be no misunderstanding upon his arrival. We would ask reservations be made for a double room for his parents, with a cot placed therein for the boy, for the period of June 16 a. m. to June 18 p. m., the expense of course to be paid by the press association of this State.

We think it would be fine if this typical American youth, by reason of his outstanding loyalty and diligence, could meet Mr. Donald Nelson and other high officials of the War Production Board. It would seem that appropriate publicity of this boy's accomplishment would prove to be an incentive and inspiration to all the youth of the Nation for their continual and renewed efforts in all future scrap-collecting campaigns.

We plan to enlist the aid of our National Representatives for a trip to the Senate and House. However, it would appear appropriate, and we trust convenient, that this fine young American's stay in Washington be primarily sponsored by the organization for which he has labored so hard.

Your early attention and reply will be awaited with interest in order that plans for the trip may go through as outlined.

Very truly yours,

LEWIS A. EMERSON,  
Executive Secretary for South Carolina.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I would have tried to be a little more courteous to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia when he asked to limit debate, but I wanted this time to answer the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER]. I asked the gentleman from New York, as you noticed, whether he believed in the Wages and Hours Act. He believed that 40 cents minimum wage is a fair minimum wage. Does he not believe in a fair return so far as the farmers of the country are concerned? No one here can contradict me, no one in this House, no one in Washington, no one in the Agricultural Department, or anywhere else who knows anything about the dairy business can contradict me when I make the statement that you cannot produce 46-cent butter at Chicago and pay any 40 cents an hour. The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations is a high-class farmer and gets his name in the big agricultural papers. I know he will not dispute that statement.

The thing I have against O. P. A. is that I am afraid they are going to starve the people of this country to death if we let them run hog wild like we have this last year. If I thought that that outfit was going to operate the coming year the way it has the past year when there seemed to be a deliberate attempt to put people out of business, having as little regard for the law or the spirit of the law as they have exhibited, it would not embarrass me at all to vote not to give them a red cent.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I shall be pleased to yield to my friend from New York.

Mr. CELLER. I am very happy to hear the gentleman's observation, and I assure him I want to see that the farmer gets a proper price for what he produces, not only that but I should like to see him have an incentive to help him further increase production. I should like to keep wages where they are. Wages should not be increased and the roll-back should help the farmer. We want the cooperation of the gentleman from Wisconsin and the cooperation of others who think as he does in that regard, but if we did not have O. P. A. what would we put in its place? What would we have without it? We would have confusion worse confounded.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman from New York. I can see a subsidy program that is based on a commodity that is bringing more than the cost of production. I am in sympathy with a subsidy program that provides food for people in the low-income brackets who are caught at this particular time, but how in the name of common sense anyone can come out for a roll-back in the price of butter from its

present level I cannot see. This morning I had the pleasure of asking Mr. Byrnes this question, "What, if any, is the reason or excuse for rolling back the price of butter when it is not bringing the cost of production? And when it will not justify a 40-cent per hour wage rate?" The 46-cent per pound Chicago floor price was fixed by Secretary Wickard and the O. P. A. Now the O. P. A. and other Government agencies want to roll the price back. If Mr. Byrnes answered it I cannot understand the English language. I have yet to find any proponent of the butter roll-back who can tell me where there is any common sense or any reason for rolling the price back on a commodity that is not bringing the cost of production.

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Milwaukee.

Mr. McMURRAY. Would the gentleman please tell me whether or not this roll-back that is proposed and that is being carried out by the Office of Price Administration reduces the return that the farmer is getting for butter?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. It will freeze the price for the producer regardless of his production costs.

Mr. McMURRAY. Will the gentleman tell me how?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I will answer the gentleman from Milwaukee by saying that once you pick out any commodity for a roll-back the price is frozen at that level regardless of cost of production; and there is not a man on this floor who can deny that statement. In that way they freeze him at whatever it may be, at 46 cents in the case of butter, I pick out butter for the reason that if you want butterfat a little bit cheaper to the people, why pick out the people who get only 40 to 50 cents a pound? Why do you not step over here into Virginia and Maryland where they have had a butterfat price of 70 cents for a long time while out in the butterfat sections of the Middle West they received as low as 30 to 35 cents per pound? Why do we not go up into New York? And what happened up there in New York? You rolled back the price on fluid milk but you did not keep it. Why did you not keep it? You pick out a commodity here that is defenseless. The gentleman knows that, too, I may say to the gentleman from New York. You know you had a subsidy on fluid milk a few months ago. Why did you not keep it when you had it?

Mr. CELLER. That is a State matter. We tried to keep it but the dairy interests up there would not let us.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. The dairy interests?

Mr. CELLER. The dairy interests had a peculiar notion about it.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Who was paying the bill for that subsidy? That is what killed it. Incidentally why do they not roll back the price of tobacco, that is 195 percent of parity? If oranges have risen in price, why roll back the price of butter?

Mr. FULMER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. FULMER. Since they talked about rolling back the price of meat, is it not a fact that hogs have gone down 1½ cents per pound?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Yes. I know the chairman of the committee is right. I appreciate his interest in fair play for all farm groups, and he has my sympathy in not being able to carry out his practical ideas. I want to say to the Members here today that as far as I am concerned, and I will put it in the RECORD, I wrote Mr. Wickard as late as a year ago last April subscribing to a subsidy program for products that are above parity prices. From there on you have some excuse for putting one on. Remember my colleagues, there are no calories in a roll-back.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT  
BOARD OF ECONOMIC WARFARE

Salaries and expenses: For all expenses necessary to enable the Board of Economic Warfare to carry out its functions and activities, including salaries of an Executive Director at \$10,000 per annum and four assistants to the Executive Director at \$9,000 per annum each, and other personal services (including aliens) in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; the acceptance and utilization of voluntary and uncompensated services; the temporary employment of persons or organizations by contract or otherwise without regard to the civil-service and classification laws or section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C. 5); procurement of services, supplies, and equipment (1) outside the United States without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes, and 3648, Revised Statutes (31 U. S. C. 529), including the rental of office space and contracts for utility services for periods of 2 years in any foreign country where required by local custom or practice, and (2) within the United States without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes, when the amount involved in any one case does not exceed \$300; travel expenses (not exceeding \$300,000 for travel within the continental limits of the United States), including (1) expenses of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the work of the Board, (2) actual transportation and other necessary expenses, and not to exceed \$10 per diem in lieu of subsistence of persons serving while away from their homes without other compensation from the United States, in an advisory capacity to the Board, (3) payment to the Chairman and the Executive Director of the Board of actual and necessary transportation, subsistence, and other expenses incidental to the performance of their duties, and (4) expenses outside the United States without regard to the Standardized Government Travel Regulations and the Subsistence Expense Act of 1926, as amended (5 U. S. C. 821), and section 901 of the act of June 29, 1936 (46 U. S. C. 1241), and (5) when specifically authorized or approved by the Executive Director of the Board or such other official as he may designate for the purpose, expenses of employees of the Board, including the transportation of their effects (in accordance with the act of October 10, 1940), to their first post of duty in a foreign country, or when transferred from one official station to another, and return to the United States; payment of living and quarters allowances to personnel stationed outside the United States in accordance with the regulations approved by the President on December 30, 1942; advances of money, upon the



furnishing of bond, to employees of the Board traveling in a foreign country, in such sums as the Executive Director of the Board shall direct; reimbursement of employees of the Board for loss of personal effects in case of marine or aircraft disaster; preparation and transportation of the remains of officers and employees who die abroad or in transit while in the dispatch of their official duties, to their former homes in this country or to a place not more distant for interment, and for the ordinary expenses of such interment; purchase and exchange of lawbooks and books of reference; the rental of news-reporting services; the purchase of, or subscription to, commercial and trade reports, newspapers, and periodicals; maintenance, operation, repair, and hire of motor-propelled or horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles; and printing and binding (not exceeding \$100,000); \$36,150,000, of which amount such sums as may be authorized by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget may be transferred to other departments or agencies of the Government for the performance by them of any of the functions or activities for which this appropriation is made, but no other agency of the Government shall perform work or render services for the Board of Economic Warfare, whether or not the performance of such work or services involves the transfer of funds or reimbursement of appropriations, unless authority therefor, in accordance with regulations issued by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall have been obtained in advance; *Provided*, That such sums as are included in this appropriation for special projects (classified in the estimates submitted to Congress as or under "Other contractual services") may be expended for travel expenses, printing and binding, and purchase of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles without regard to the limitations specified for such objects under this appropriation but within such amounts as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget may approve therefor and such Director shall report to Congress each such limitation determined by him: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$10,000,000 of this appropriation shall be available to meet emergencies of a confidential character to be expended under the direction of the Executive Director, who shall make a certificate of the amount of such expenditure which he may think it advisable not to specify, and every such certificate shall be deemed a sufficient voucher for the amount therein certified.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: Page 4, line 14, after the semicolon, strike out "\$36,150,000" and insert "\$33,250,000."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman makes that request will he yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I take it for granted that some discussion on this amendment is in order. In order to know how much time will be required, I wonder if we can reach an agreement to limit debate? I would like to know how many expect to speak on this amendment.

I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 45 minutes, the first 10 minutes to be reserved to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, there are two other Members I am very sure will desire to speak on this amendment and they are not on the floor at the moment.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. How much time does the gentleman think we should have?

Mr. TABER. Ten additional minutes.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Make it 60 minutes, the first 10 minutes to be consumed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], and 10 minutes to be reserved for the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, may I say that the allotment of time in here is a little hard for some of us to understand. There are a good many Members of this House who get the floor when they want it and some of the rest of us have a hard time getting the floor and we cannot keep it after we get it. This is not at all directed to the Chairman of the Committee. I want to speak against this amendment and I should like to ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, make it 65 minutes, 10 minutes to be consumed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], 10 minutes by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL], and 10 minutes by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. McMURRAY].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment to save \$2,900,000, and I have split that up to cut \$300,000 out of an increase of \$500,000 in domestic travel inside the United States by the domestic branch of the O. W. I. They proposed to increase that from \$150,000 to \$650,000.

I propose to cut the increase for the Office of Imports \$750,000. They propose to increase it from \$1,000,000 a year to \$2,500,000.

I propose to cut the Office of Exports, which is increased from \$2,000,000 to \$2,600,000 by \$300,000.

I propose to cut the foreign travel which is raised in this bill from \$600,000 to \$2,789,000, or over four and one-half times, by \$600,000. They want to use four and one-half times as much for travel with about the same amount of help.

On account of the increase in the Economic Warfare analysts, I propose a cut of \$500,000 out of a proposed increase of \$1,350,000.

With reference to the General Counsel's Office, they propose an increase of \$259,000. I propose a cut of \$100,000 of this.

On the administrative management, where they proposed an increase from \$675,000 to \$1,110,000, I propose a cut of \$250,000 out of this increase.

Incidentally, may I say with reference to the Office of Imports that they

have a crew there which draws an average pay of \$3,500 per year. It is absolutely ridiculous the way they have spread out.

In reference to the Office of Exports, may I say that their present activity is being cut by the operations of the Lend-Lease Administration, which currently and in the next year will supply 70 percent of the exports, the other exports being only 30 percent of the total. I propose to cut their increase there so that it will only be an increase of \$1,300,000, which is plenty.

The foreign-travel program is so absolutely ridiculous as to be almost beyond explanation. The increase proposed is four and one-half times, with about the same amount of help, and it is absolutely indefensible.

The economic analysts are planning this after-the-war stuff. They do not want the activities of the Board of Economic Warfare restricted after the war is over. They want to go along. These fellows are doing just the thing that is balling up our whole economic situation. They ought to be cut.

In the General Counsel's office there are 66 lawyers, with nothing for more than 2 or 3 to do. It is perfectly ridiculous.

I want to refer a little bit in the short time I have to some of the type of personnel before I get through. The administrative management proposition is absolutely indefensible. They want 16 percent of their total appropriation for administrative management and the clerical detail of handling their appropriation and drawing their checks. It is perfectly ridiculous. What I propose there is a cut of \$250,000, which will put them down to about 13 percent of the total, and that is double what it ought to be.

They have 850 economic analysts, a perfectly ridiculous number. They have people in there who would almost surprise you. They took four persons over from the O. W. I. within a couple of months. They have one woman there at \$3,200 who used to be a newspaper reporter, and that is her experience as an economic analyst. They have a man named Fleming at \$8,000 as head economic analyst. He was formerly a publicity artist with the Department of Agriculture. He was formerly Chief of the Bureau of Graphics and Printing in the O. W. I. He has come over there at \$8,000 as head economic analyst. What qualifications has he for such a position? None at all.

Here is a funny one: Joseph W. Martin, an intelligence officer, formerly with the Library of Congress at \$3,800, taken over a month or so ago. Just think of it, taking a fellow out of the Library of Congress, a clerk over there, and making him an intelligence officer.

Here is Joseph S. Petty, former instructor at Harvard at \$2,750, raised to \$6,500. He comes in from the O. W. I., where he had nothing of that kind to do, a publicity job, but now he is a head economic analyst. That is the kind of people they have.

I have another one here who was a personnel officer in the N. Y. A. He received \$1,260 in the N. Y. A. He is an assistant air transportation analyst. What they need one of those for nobody knows. He has been raised to \$2,900.

Then we have a Chief of the Air Branch in the B. E. W. at \$8,000. He used to be a professor of law. He has had no transportation experience whatever.

Here is a fellow who is an economic analyst whose experience is that of a dairyman and a poultryman.

Here is a fellow who is a principal attorney. He is getting \$5,600. His qualifications are that he was an attorney with the Resettlement Administration at \$2,000. They ought to know better than to put such people on their rolls. That is one of the reasons why I say it is so easy for them to cut in this agency.

I have analyzed these cuts. There is absolutely no disputing the fact that that organization would function a good deal better and a good deal more intelligently if they cut out that kind of employment, if they got rid of that bunch of supernumeraries who are a burden to it and who make it a cumbersome thing instead of something that is devoted to the war effort.

I know we will have a plea that this is devoted to the war effort, but let me tell you that this kind of a set-up is not devoted to the war effort. It is devoted to providing jobs for men who have no qualifications for them. I have been over the list of the men they have there.

There may be 3 or 4 percent of the group who have come from business and are experienced, but they are the exceptions to the rule. This job can be done and done much more efficiently if it is cut down to the point where they cannot keep these people on the roll who have no business there.

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. The gentleman will have plenty of time to explain these things, if he can explain them. If he is going to rise here as an exponent of incompetent and unqualified help, that will help my amendment.

Mr. McMURRAY. I should like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. TABER. That is the only thing the gentleman can argue in favor of keeping this item in here, as large as it is. I am trying to put some efficiency into this outfit by showing them where they can cut and how they can cut to make it a good job.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL] for 10 minutes.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, "Uneasy lies the head that wears the crown."

As these various appropriation bills have come to the floor of the House, I have sympathized most deeply with the poor, unfortunate, patriotic men who are willing to accept places as heads of these Government bureaus. If you will think back over the number of appropriations that have come in here, you will recall

that there are any number of men who have gone into the service of their country in these Government bureaus who came and justified the appropriations, and when their names were brought out on the floor of the House there was nothing but vilification, abuse, and the most dire criticism of them. Few seem to appreciate the difficult job they have to perform.

The gentleman from New York, splendid gentleman that he is, gives three-fourths of his time to sarcasm, vituperation, and to denouncing the men at the head of the various bureaus, and most of his argument is a vehement statement as to personalities or some extraneous consideration.

I defy you to go back through the record and see where there have been any basic analyses of the job in any of these departments given by the gentleman from New York or the others which strike at the conduct of the work and the job they are doing. It is all criticism. I think we as Congressmen should be a little bit sympathetic to a charge of that sort because we are somewhat in the limelight ourselves. I have heard things about my colleagues in Congress that I do not believe, and it is the same way as to the bureaus. Let us be just a little more fair and see the job that these men are doing. All the criticism, all the vituperation, all the personal references do not change the fact that this is one of the most important war agencies of any department in the Government. What is being done is highly important, and bears the enthusiastic support of the War Department.

Let us see what these people are actually doing—not because you like or don't like someone. The B. E. W. has three divisions of its war work. One is the question of bringing imports into this country. What is that job? We need rubber, quartz crystals, insecticides, mahogany, mica, and dozens of other commodities that I could mention. The B. E. W. has been supplying these war needs and deficiencies. This Board of Economic Warfare, this Board under Milo Perkins, and Mr. Perkins, in my opinion, if I may differ with the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], is not only one of the best witnesses who ever appeared before our committee, but is one of the most competent men in Government service, and is doing, with his organization, a wonderful job. He is sending men all over the world, to see if they can get these important strategic materials, which we must have to wage a successful war. Sixty percent of our tin was cut off, 95 percent of the quinine, so important to the life of our boys, and many other things that I could mention. As to cinchona, of which quinine is made, that was almost completely cut off, and without it many, many soldiers, more than we realize, who have contracted malaria from being in tropical countries, would be in a desperate physical condition. They would have been without quinine had it not been for this group, who have gone to the far reaches of the world to get it, and all of these other necessities. The gentleman from New York can say, let us cut it

down \$600,000—that they don't need so many men in Africa, but if you do that, you will be doing a very ill-considered act.

The second job is export. This job is organized and export licenses are issued. The job was to see that the strategic materials in this country did not leave the United States, and, further, that none of these materials could directly or indirectly get to the Axis Powers. That job is a tremendous job, and unless you are informed you cannot realize how big it is. Talk about these cuts. You are going into an organization that has a tremendous volume of work to do, and this amendment would cut some most necessary functions. In 1942 there were one and a quarter million licenses that were examined, and it takes a tremendous force to do that. This business of exporting is not simply shipping to some fellow in South America who may apparently be a native of that country, but to know that he is not an agent of the Axis Powers.

The gentleman speaks about the great number of attorneys, and does it with all of the prejudice that he can inject into his remarks.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PLOESER. I have the greatest respect for the gentleman from Kentucky, but I was just wondering whether in his praise of Milo Perkins whether the gentleman realizes he is one of the advocates of Government management and ownership in the post-war effort and one of the Hansen school of revolutionists in this country.

Mr. O'NEAL. I would like to say to the gentleman that while I do not like to make personal references, yet the gentleman will find that in his personal family relationship Mr. Milo Perkins has made a great contribution to this war, almost as much as any man can.

Mr. PLOESER. Oh, I do not doubt that in his personal family relationship.

Mr. O'NEAL. To continue with what I was about to say, in the B. E. W. they happen to have on the rolls 117 people who were drawing, prior to B. E. W. employment, between \$6,600 and \$7,500 per annum, 105 who were drawing from \$7,500 to \$10,000 per annum, 111 people who were drawing from \$10,000 to \$25,000, and from \$25,000 a year they have 47, and that is as competent a group as you can find, and it is very easy to say that the whole thing is very poorly managed and that this is the craziest bunch you ever saw, but that does not mean a thing. The fact remains that the leadership in this organization is composed of some of the best brains in America.

I am about to conclude, but if I can in my time I would like to mention something about the job of economic war analysis. I am sorry that I cannot go fully into that. In the first place, we were asked to keep it off the record. But let me say as much as I can without saying too much of a military nature. The intelligent way to bomb Germany and Japan is to know what is there before you bomb it. You want to know where the



factories are located that are making highly important contributions to their war effort. You want to know how difficult it is to get to that area, and what is there, and the B. E. W. furnishes information of that character, so much so that it has drawn the highest praise from the Army. I think this amendment, by all means, if we are interested in the war effort, should be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I am particularly interested in this appropriation and completely convinced that it should not be cut down, because I feel, as does the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL] that here we have a place where the best business brains have been gathered together for important war tasks.

The suggestion was made a few moments ago that perhaps only 3 or 4 percent of these men in B. E. W. had had contact with industry. I want to repeat to you a statement I made on this floor yesterday that of the 502 top people in this office, 380 of them have come from private business and nearly 10 percent of that number were drawing \$25,000 a year before they came here. Why did they come? They came because they liked to fight, and their physical condition and their age has made it impossible for some of those men to fight at the front. They have given up \$25,000 salaries to come into the Board of Economic Warfare and fight with economics against the Axis Powers. Where do you suppose the fighting is going on in Turkey today? Not in guns or tanks or planes. No. It is going on in the Board of Economic Warfare, insofar as our country is concerned, and in a similar spot as far as Germany is concerned. We fight in those neutral countries economically. Later we may be fighting with guns and tanks and planes, but now the preliminary work is being done by this fine agency.

I told the House yesterday that these 2 volumes of hearings cost us \$15 per set and I hoped the Members might look at them. I hold up to you now pages 432 and 433 in part 2 of the hearings. There you will see a list of the previous business connections of more than 40 men who have given up jobs of more than \$25,000 a year to come into this agency. You should remember that when you vote on this amendment and realize that many men have found a battle line in this great part of the war effort; that they are attracted to it as our young boys are attracted to the job of fighting against the Axis Powers.

There is involved in this motion an appeal to cut down travel expense. There is only one way you can fight an economic warfare, and that is to get there first. That means flying across oceans at great expense. There is only one thing you can do when you run out of quinine for the boys in Guadalcanal and north Africa, and that is to try to get the last remaining supply. When Japan cut off 75 percent of our quinine, the Board of Economic Warfare rushed to Ecuador,

and they have brought back from that country a sufficient supply so that our medical service will tell us that there is enough for any emergency. I think that is an important part of the war effort. I know that all of us here today want to see that done for the boys who are facing climatic conditions different from those they have enjoyed before. We have no tropics in the United States, but the war strangely seems to have shifted chiefly to tropical locations. I think an important job has been done by this great, fine American organization in that particular field and we should give it sufficient travel funds to insure that it is able to get quickly to any part of the world.

If I could refer you again for just a moment to some figures I have here, I tried to indicate to you that in this group of people in the agency, 380 of the top 502 men had come from private business; that of this group 117 had previously made from \$5,600 to \$7,500 a year; that 105 made from \$7,500 to \$10,000 a year; that 111 had made from \$10,000 to \$25,000 a year; and 47 of them had made more than \$25,000.

This is the smartest and most alert group of employees and executives in any of our war agencies covered in this bill. The Board of Economic Warfare has been doing a fine, aggressive job, and I think it would be too bad if its funds were to be reduced. I hope that the amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JOHNSON].

BOARD OF ECONOMIC WARFARE—IS IT HIDING ITS LIGHT UNDER A BUSHEL?

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, after reading the report on this bill and listening to some of the members of the committee tell of the glories of the activities of the various war agencies whose appropriations are included, I have been struck by the fact that the Board of Economic Warfare apparently rates very highly in the estimation of the majority of the committee. Its appropriation not only appears first in the bill, but it is one of the few agencies which has escaped without a reduction in the Budget estimates. B. E. W. asked for \$36,150,000 and was granted the full amount, an increase of \$13,206,154 over the amount that has been available in 1943.

The report speaks highly of the testimony of Milo Perkins, the Executive Director of B. E. W., and we are informed that his testimony needs to be read to realize the grave importance of the work that is being done by that organization on the world economic front and the crucial part it is taking in the war effort. Evidently Mr. Perkins is a very persuasive witness and aided by the effective assistance of his boss, the Chairman of B. E. W., our Vice President, Mr. WALLACE, he has done a good job of convincing the majority of the committee that their work is so necessary and valuable that not a single penny of its request for 1944 should be touched. One cannot help but admire B. E. W.'s persuasiveness.

But I was astonished to note in the hearings on page 443, the following statement of Mr. Milo Perkins:

I learned long ago that in this town the more you can stay out of the limelight the more work you can get done. That is the way we operate in B. E. W. Witness our very small information staff.

Those are strange words to come from such a prominent new dealer as Milo Perkins who has been noted for his crusading zeal and ability as a supersalesman. Was it not Mr. Perkins who put over the stamp plan for the distribution of surplus agricultural commodities? And has not Mr. Perkins been the Vice President's right hand bower in promoting his collectivism ideas for spreading brotherhood throughout the world?

I understand that the B. E. W. has an information staff of 18 people at an annual salary cost of \$58,760. That is a very small staff according to New Deal standards. True, 18 is only a small part of the 3,200 Government publicity employees which the New Deal is requiring the taxpayers to pay, but it is 18 too many. But B. E. W. does not rely too heavily upon professional informational people for the great amount of favorable publicity which it has received. After all, the Vice President and Mr. Perkins are past masters in the art of getting publicity, and they do a good job of propaganda on their own.

Did not the Vice President recently take another trip through Latin America in the interest of promoting our good-neighbor policy down there? As Chairman of the Board of Economic Warfare, he must have been doing a bit of missionary work for B. E. W. export and import policies. Great publicity on this was had without the assistance of the B. E. W. professional information staff.

Have we not seen a number of press articles recently about the great work B. E. W. is doing in securing imports of strategic materials from all over the world? Have we not heard a great deal of the so-called preclusive buying operations of the B. E. W. in Spain, Portugal, and Turkey to keep the Axis from getting badly needed materials? Did not Mr. Perkins tell us in strong and vigorous terms a few months back how B. E. W. had stepped in to speed up the import program which it alleged was bogging down under the R. F. C.?

Much publicity has been issued about the so-called economic-warfare analysis work of B. E. W. Have we not often been told in glowing terms of what the B. E. W. is doing to wage economic warfare? I do not mean to question the value of a great deal of this work. My point is that B. E. W. is clearly not "hiding its light under a bushel," and to contend that B. E. W. is not in the limelight is to misrepresent the facts in the situation.

The Vice President and Milo Perkins have been very persuasive in selling their ideas and policies, and they have not succeeded in this by keeping still—the New Deal does not operate that way.

When hostilities cease and the facts are deliberated upon and a calm survey

made, the B. E. W. will no doubt be very much in the limelight, and only then might need its entire staff of professional informational propagandists to supplement the efforts of the Vice President and Mr. Perkins.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS].

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, when Pearl Harbor overtook us this country was utterly unprepared in many aspects to wage war. For instance, there was not enough mica available for our use to equip 1,000 airplanes, much less 50,000. You cannot make airplane spark plugs without mica. It has to be of a certain kind and quality. We had practically none. That is one of the thousands of instances demonstrating the necessity for the Bureau of Economic Warfare. My hat is off to that organization for the splendid job it has done and for the careful planning that has gone into it in spite of the high pressure under which the many imperious war necessities caused them to work. Its hastily assembled personnel has rung the bell of admirable achievement in thousands of cases wherein winning economic battles meant winning the war.

Criticism has been made of the propaganda agency or publicity staff of this organization. There are thousands of activities of this Bureau of Economic Warfare that it would be almost traitorous to divulge. There are only a limited few that may be publicized. This staff is not for the purpose of propagandizing those few known activities to keep the home fires burning, but to build fires and counterfires abroad that are necessary in order that we may get or save from unnecessary export the strategic materials we need and in some cases need desperately. On the import front of our economic battleground this publicity staff must soften the sales resistance to our getting. On the export front this staff must sell our program of export licenses to our allies who are trusting us to help them help us and the common cause. Into such efforts goes the propaganda of this agency. It is not for the aggrandizement of B. E. W., nor of any man, men, or agency, but solely for the achievement of the ends for which this agency of our national war effort was created.

Everything B. E. W. does is more or less of a secret, a war secret, and that is why we know so little about its victories.

But I want to say just a few words more with regard to this organization. No one could simplify an organization any more than Milo Perkins has simplified this one. Imports? Because we need such items as mica, tungsten, tin, hemp, and various strategic woods in our war effort. Exports? Because we have got to keep what we must have to make our country into a real and effective arsenal of the democracies, so that we may supply our friends and ourselves with war-making essentials. And the economic analysts, because unless they know their stuff and get the true dope on what sinews of war our enemies have and lack, we cannot intelligently plan our military offense or defense. Every

drive made during this war, practically, by our enemies has been for an economic motive. Why was Rumania taken over? For oil. Why was Russia invaded? For oil and wheat and other raw materials of war. So it has been, and so it will be in most cases. Therefore we simply must know these economic answers if we are to plan our war effort wisely.

No one has ever claimed that B. E. W. has not done a grand job on each one of these three fronts of economic warfare—imports, exports, and economic analysis. The attack is made on personnel and personalities. Opponents say Milo Perkins agrees with the Hanson school of post-war thought for planning a world reorganization. Be that as it may, that is not what Milo Perkins is doing now. He, as much as anyone else in America, is bending every thought and energy of his nature to one engrossing passion—to do his utmost toward winning this war.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I will be glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. That is just exactly what Mr. Quinlan, Chief of the Coffee Section, said in a letter of February 13, 1943, and which I inserted in the RECORD yesterday.

Mr. HOBBS. I never heard of the gentleman and did not know there was such a letter.

Mr. TABER. He is one of the leaders.

Mr. HOBBS. I never heard of the gentleman to whom the gentleman from New York refers, but I am delighted to have the support of such a statement. I am indebted to the gentleman from New York for calling attention to the letter and for putting it in the RECORD. There is no harder worker, no more conscientious man in this House, nor a better American than the gentleman from New York, JOHN TABER, nor a man whose services are more welcome in this body.

But by saying that, I do not mean that I think him omniscient; as good as he is, he is still human, and we all reserve the right to disagree with each other.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I am always delighted to yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I want to agree with what the gentleman from Alabama has said about the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. But he, like the rest of us, sometimes makes mistakes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time was fixed and all time has been allotted.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama 1 minute from the additional 5 minutes unallotted.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman. I just want to say this

one thing further: Not only has this program been justified by competent and sufficient evidence to the satisfaction of our Appropriations Committee, but the need for the increase of this appropriation is perfectly apparent. Here we find ourselves in global war with an expanding personnel in the air, in the Army and in the Navy. Everything is on the upgrade, necessarily expanding, and it is surprising to me that the management of the Board of Economic Warfare has been able to curtail its need to only a \$13,000,000 increase.

Members of the Committee, I beg of you that you do not deny a cent to any fighting force of our Government in this critical year of our war; do not go back on the Appropriations Committee of this House, which heard the evidence supporting every item, and has solemnly certified in this bill that every dollar of this \$36,000,000 will be needed by this, our only fighting force engaged on our economic war front.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] for 5 minutes.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I do not think there is any occasion for bringing the war into the matter now under discussion. Every Member of this House can be counted on to do everything in his power to bring about victory at the earliest possible moment.

Neither do I think that personalities or prejudice have anything to do with the question.

The matter under consideration is simply a dispassionate, cold-blooded question of dollars and cents. We all want to make available whatever is necessary for the effective operation of this agency within its proper field—none of us want to make available funds in excess of those needed for the proper functioning of the agency. Personally, in the light of the testimony before your committee, I believe that a substantial slash in the Budget estimate is entirely justified.

The request before us at this time is for \$36,150,000. This is 300 percent of the funds made available by the Congress to the Bureau of Economic Warfare for the current fiscal year. It is 57 percent in excess of the funds available this year, if we add the funds which the agency received from the emergency funds of the President.

The record indicates that there were only 2,819 people on the rolls of the agency in this country, as of April 30, although there was authorization for 3,197. The request contemplates that the number 2,819 be increased by 1,000 people, bringing the total up to 3,816.

I hold in my hand a list of about 175 of the personnel on the rolls of B. E. W. All of these persons have had a very substantial increase in salary as compared with their salary prior to entering the service of the Government or as compared with their initial salary with the Board of Economic Warfare or both.

The Justice Department has a salary average of \$2,256, the Commerce Department average is \$2,048, the State Department average is \$2,000. What is



the salary average of B. E. W.? In the Bureau of Exports it will be \$2,483, as compared with \$2,472 in the current fiscal year. In the Bureau of Economic Warfare Analysis it will be \$3,117 as compared with \$3,077 in the current year. In the Bureau of Imports the average will be \$3,508 as compared with \$3,488 in the current fiscal year—\$3,508 as compared with the \$2,000 average for the State Department.

I have not time to go into further detail here. The gentleman from New York has given you a break-down, item by item, in terms of a table furnished your committee showing the dollars and cents requested for each of the major activities of this agency for 1944 as compared with actual expenditures in the current fiscal year.

Among other items in respect to which he suggests a very moderate cut is the travel item. I think a further cut could be made in this item without hurting any reasonable activity of this agency. Three million three hundred and forty-nine thousand dollars is requested for travel in 1944 although the estimated expenditures for 1943 amounts to \$1,100,000. The increase requested amounts to about 300 percent.

I am not attempting to decry for one moment the important work which this agency is doing. I believe, however, that that work can be done on a more economical basis.

I believe also, that in the past, B. E. W. has expended money extravagantly and sponsored projects that had better not have been embarked upon. I believe that it has caused friction and duplication of effort with other agencies notably the Department of State and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or its subsidiaries. I believe that it has been handicapped by theorists as distinguished from those with practical experience.

I am glad to note that Mr. Perkins feels that friction and duplication of effort have now been eliminated. I am glad also to note his conviction that the rigid control under B. E. W. is desirable only in respect to the period of the war.

I hope that B. E. W. will limit itself in the performance of its important work to a course which is realistic and practical and as economical as is consistent with the war effort.

I believe it will have ample funds for this purpose if the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER] for 5 minutes.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I join with my friend from Massachusetts in saying I have no purpose whatever in indulging in personalities. I certainly hope I shall not be charged by the gentleman from Kentucky or anyone else with indulging in vituperation and abuse. It seems to me we have a very practical, common-sense, cold-blooded propo-

sition before us which is: To what extent should a Government agency be permitted and encouraged to carry on its activity in a wasteful and in an extravagant way? There can be no doubt that the Board of Economic Warfare can do and has done meritorious service in certain fields. I am not taking issue with some of the activities that the Board of Economic Warfare is carrying on; I am in no way critical of some of the very laudable things that have been accomplished. Those of us who are presently making an effort to reduce the over-all costs of the agency are doing so largely because we feel that the Board of Economic Warfare has not been a good householder. We have innumerable instances in the record of the hearings where very substantial increases in salary have been made to those identified with the activity. Let me explain what I mean when I say substantial increases; let me explain the practice in which this outfit indulges. The Board of Economic Warfare has conducted what might be characterized as a competitive effort with other Government agencies in securing analysts, specialists, economists, and all the other "ists" it has on its rolls. It has gone into the competitive field and by offering increases in salaries, substantial increases in salaries, it has induced employees from other governmental agencies to come over to its staff. It results in waste and extravagance. Unfortunately these characteristics are evident not only in the field of personnel but they also prevail in its entire field of operation. It wastes money. It wastes money in its travel program; it wastes money in its communications; it wastes money in its personnel program by carrying an excessive number in every category of employment. I want to point out a table I have in hand here and give you the number of analysts and specialists this group has gathered together.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for the purpose of clarifying this proposition?

Mr. DITTER. I will yield in the hope that I may ask for further time.

Mr. O'NEAL. I have no objection to the gentleman's asking for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time has been allocated.

Mr. DITTER. If somebody is at hand who has not used his time, possibly he would yield it to me.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] reserved two places, 10 minutes of time, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania was allocated 5 minutes. If the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] wishes to release part of his 5 minutes he may do so.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that the gentleman from Massachusetts still has 5 minutes which has not been consumed. I suggest that the gentleman from Penn-

sylvania be allowed that 5 minutes, unless there is objection.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the suggestion the Chair made to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I agree to the suggestion.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? I shall be very brief.

Mr. DITTER. I yield to my friend.

Mr. O'NEAL. The gentleman is always very fair. Will he not explain to the Committee that the term "analyst" is a civil-service classification which embraces many different types of employment? Some Members seem to think when used in this connection it has some other connotation than that of the civil-service classification. It includes all types of jobs.

Mr. DITTER. I hope that I in no way created the impression by the use of the word "analyst" that I was casting any reflection upon any of those who might hold that position. True enough it is a civil-service classification. As my friend observes, the term "analyst" takes in a great number of groups of individuals. There are 853 odd analysts on the roll of the Board of Economic Warfare. There are 82 lawyers. The clerks and stenographers go up to 2,316. In all, O. E. W. has 3,816 employees. It is pay-roll padding at its best. It cannot be justified under any circumstances. The distinguished son of Virginia who has always been known as one of the men interested in economy of Government and who has established a reputation for it. I feel certain he will join wholeheartedly with me in paring down personnel to the bone, that the surplusage be eliminated, that the unnecessary jobs be ended, and that the Board of Economic Warfare carry on its objectives with the number of individuals which a reasonable and a sensible man would find necessary.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DITTER. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I concur heartily with everything the gentleman has said. I just want to make this suggestion to the gentleman which I do not think has been touched on in debate. The Board of Economic Warfare performs one function none of us has said anything about that is very vital. Every single export of any description that goes out of this country has to be passed through the Board of Economic Warfare to be analyzed as to what it is and where it is going. In the beginning that was confined to critical war materials only to see that they did not get to our enemies. Now it covers every material and that, of course, takes a large force of clerical and statistical people.

Mr. DITTER. May I follow with the observation that a large number of those activities are overlapping activities with other agencies of government?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. There is no other agency that does that.

Mr. DITTER. And other existing agencies of government could well look after the supervisory tasks to which the gentleman has referred.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DITTER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. It may be observed that no exports under lend-lease are included in the jurisdiction of B. E. W. at all.

Mr. DITTER. That is a splendid contribution. In other words, lend-lease is the great part of our export trade today. The B. E. W. has nothing to do with what we are giving to our allies and it in no way controls the exports that are going to England, to Russia, and to the other nations of the world under our lend-lease program.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Everything except lend-lease goes through the Board of Economic Warfare.

Mr. DITTER. But that "but" is so large that the justification which the gentleman from Virginia is trying to place on this new activity does not hold true. We are lend-leasing today to the tune of 70 percent of our exports. There is nothing left but the meager amount of 30 percent for Mr. Milo Perkins to handle.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. McMURRAY] for 10 minutes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I suggest that when the gentleman from Wisconsin was called he was not present and, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER] having spoken, therefore there is no opportunity for anyone to reply to anything that the gentleman from Wisconsin says as there should be in an orderly procedure. It creates a situation that is very unfair to this side of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair may say to the distinguished gentleman from New York that the gentleman from Wisconsin was allocated 10 minutes to speak by unanimous consent just like the two gentlemen unnamed were reserved by the gentleman from Massachusetts and they have spoken. The Chair thinks it would be unfair to deny the gentleman from Wisconsin the time.

Mr. TABER. It is also unfair to our side in the normal course of parliamentary procedure when we have no opportunity to reply.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. McMURRAY] for 10 minutes.

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Chairman, a great deal of the discussion on this amendment has revolved around the personnel of the Board of Economic Warfare, the number of people, what they are doing, or what they are supposed to be doing, and also the quality and qualifications of that personnel. In order to better inform the Members of this House about the issue on which they have to vote, I am going to read to you copy of a letter written by Maj. Gen. G. V. Strong,

who is, as all of you probably know, head of the Intelligence Division of the United States Army and chairman of the joint intelligence committee of the joint chiefs of staff.

I do not blame the Members for not listening to me, but I think they ought to listen to Major General Strong. His letter is as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,  
Washington, June 12, 1943.

Mr. MILO PERKINS,  
Board of Economic Warfare,  
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR Mr. PERKINS: I should like to invite your attention to the developments of the past year in the use of reports prepared by the Board of Economic Warfare in connection with the activities both of the joint intelligence committee and the military information division of the General Staff. The economic material, furnished by the Board of Economic Warfare, has been most useful in connection with estimates of Axis capabilities, both in Europe and the Far East. The services performed by the Board of Economic Warfare, particularly in regard to the oil situation, have been outstanding and far more accurate than information received from any other source. As chairman of the joint intelligence committee of the joint chiefs of staff, I have come to lean heavily upon your Board of Economic Warfare representatives on the committee and on its subcommittees, in determining accurate and analytical questions which are of vital importance to sound decisions bearing upon tactical and strategic plans.

Mr. JENSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McMURRAY. Just as soon as I finish this letter.

Mr. JENSEN. I think I could give the gentleman some information about this letter. Every Member of the Congress has this same letter. You are spending a lot of time that you should be using to talk about something else. That is why the House is not in order. They do not want to listen to that. The Members have already read it.

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Chairman, perhaps a good many Members of the House have read this letter. I may say that a good many Members of the House do not seem to be aware of what this personnel does or who these people are. I have some statements of my own to add, if I have time.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McMURRAY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Does not the gentleman agree with me that a careful reading of this letter of Major General Strong would lead to the conclusion it would be just as sensible to cut down on this activity as it would be to cut down on some directly military matter?

Mr. McMURRAY. I thank the gentleman from California. That is exactly the point I want to make. When you try to cut the appropriation of the Board of Economic Warfare you are doing a thing just as vicious as cutting the appropriation for the War Department. This ought to be understood by the members of this committee when they vote.

Mr. JENSEN. I would recommend that the gentleman go ahead and give his ideas on that letter because the

rest of us have already read it and studied it.

Mr. McMURRAY. I thank the gentleman for his suggestion. This letter continues:

The reports and analyses submitted to the joint intelligence committee, through your representatives, have been of outstanding value and a material contribution to the over-all picture which is essential to sound intelligence and the basis for sound planning. In addition, your organization has been particularly helpful in various problems arising in the estimation of the Axis positions in regard to strategic materials, foodstuffs, industrial capacity, and potentialities of the German and Japanese war machines.

In the Government service we are too often prone to accept services as a matter of course and without any particular recognition. In view of the heavy burden which my organizations have undoubtedly placed upon yours, I desire to take this opportunity to express to you and, through you, to the personnel of your organization my very keen appreciation and heartfelt thanks for the close cooperation and the outstanding services performed by the personnel of the Board of Economic Warfare.

Very sincerely yours,

GEO. V. STRONG,

Major General, Acting Chief of Staff, G-2.

Mr. Chairman, I am sorry if I have imposed upon the time of some of my colleagues in order to complete the reading of this letter. I did so because after listening to the arguments here against this agency I am firmly convinced that some of my colleagues have not read the letter and that some of my colleagues have no appreciation of the real issue on which they are being asked to vote. If all of my colleagues had had the opportunity which I have had and which other members of the Foreign Affairs Committee have had of hearing the testimony in executive session of Mr. Milo Perkins, Director of the Board of Economic Warfare, I am sure that a great many of the statements made here about that agency, its personnel and its activities, would not have been made.

I am very sure that each man who votes for this amendment to cut out necessary funds from the appropriation for the Board of Economic Warfare would realize, if he had looked at the facts and listened to the testimony I have heard, that in doing so he is cutting out the very heart of our war effort, a part of the war effort that is just as important as the generals in the field and the troops under their direction. This is a war activity. This is an agency set up to fight this war. This agency has an outstanding record of performance, a record which is known to every man who has heard the testimony, a great deal of which must be given in executive session. Those who oppose this agency must be willing to say, "We want to cripple the Army, we want to cripple the war effort. We do not want the United States to fight this war efficiently and effectively."

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McMURRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I realize that the gentleman is on a committee that has heard much testimony in this regard, but



if he were on the Committee on Appropriations he would also realize that we must try to get at least as much for our money as we can, especially under the present conditions when we are scraping bottom and when the American taxpayer is going to be burdened from now on for Lord knows how long.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGLESWORTH] struck the keynote of this proposition when he said that he would not for one moment detract from the importance of this work. I think everyone who heard the testimony or who will read the testimony will agree that among these agencies this is one of the most vitally important. Then why reduce the Budget estimate, every dollar of which is needed?

No reason has been advanced why this \$3,000,000 should be taken out of this already meager allowance. It has not been shown that any money was wasted, there is no indication that there has been any extravagance, it has not been shown that there is any maladministration. No reason has been advanced to show why this should be decreased.

It is true, as has been said, that some of these men were getting higher salaries than they drew in former positions, but—and this ought to be emphasized—none of these war agencies is outside the civil service. They are all under the Classification Act. The Civil Service Commission, and not the agency, fixes these rates of pay.

The evidence before the committee in the hearings shows that but for the work of this agency we would more than once have had to discontinue production in production plants turning out some of the most important machinery of war; that but for this agency we would not have had at the critical time strategic material essential to continuation of production of bombing planes and other war machinery.

We are in great peril. There is no assurance that the war is won; at least, we cannot afford to take chances. In view of the fact that they have given us no reason for making this cut, and the further fact that every dollar provided by the bill is needed—as a matter of fact, even more money is needed, and if any change is made in this figure it ought to be increased instead of decreased—in view of the fact that no case has been made, no reason has been given, no argument has been advanced, no evidence has been submitted as to why we should decrease this fund by one dollar, I submit that the amount recommended by the committee should be retained.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 112, noes 119.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. TABER and Mr. CANNON of Missouri.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 134, noes 149.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

Salaries and expenses: For all necessary expenses of the Office of Price Administration in carrying out the provisions of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended by the act of October 2, 1942 (50 U. S. C. App. 901), and the provisions of the act of May 31, 1941 (55 Stat. 236), as amended by the Second War Powers Act, 1942 (50 U. S. C. App. 622), and all other powers, duties, and functions which may be lawfully delegated to the Office of Price Administration, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; expenses of in-service training of employees, including salaries and traveling expenses of instructors; not to exceed \$55,000 for the employment of aliens; not to exceed \$30,000 for the temporary employment of persons or organizations, by contract or otherwise, without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes, or the civil-service and classification laws; contract stenographic reporting services; witness fees; purchase of lawbooks, books of reference, newspapers, and periodicals; printing and binding (not to exceed \$1,830,815, which limitation shall not apply to the printing of forms, instructions, regulations, and coupon books incidental to the rationing of commodities); maintenance, repair, and operation of passenger-carrying vehicles; traveling expenses (not to exceed \$7,250,000), including (1) attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the work of the Office of Price Administration, (2) actual transportation and other necessary expenses and not to exceed \$10 per diem in lieu of subsistence of persons serving while away from their homes in an advisory capacity without other compensation from the United States, or at \$1 per annum, (3) reimbursement, at not to exceed 3 cents per mile, of employees for expenses incurred by them in official travel in privately owned automobile within the limits of their official stations, (4) expenses of appointees from point of induction in continental United States to their first post of duty in the Territories, and (5) expenses to and from their homes or regular places of business in accordance with the Standardized Government Travel Regulations, including travel in privately owned automobile (and including per diem in lieu of subsistence at place of employment), of persons employed intermittently away from their homes or regular places of business as consultants and receiving compensation on a per diem when actually employed basis; \$165,000,000, of which sum not less than \$59,551,042 shall be allocated for direct obligations of local war price and rationing boards; sums under such appropriation of \$165,000,000 may be transferred to other departments or agencies of the Government for the performance by them of any of the functions or activities for which this appropriation is made, but unless otherwise authorized by law, no other agency of the Government shall perform work or render services for the Office of Price Administration, whether or not the performance of such work or services involves the transfer of funds or reimbursement of appropriations, unless authority therefor by the Bureau of the Budget shall have been obtained in advance: *Provided*, That sums set apart for special projects (classified in the estimates submitted to Congress as or under "Other contractual services") may be expended for travel expenses, and printing and binding without regard to the limitations herein specified for such objects, but within such

amounts as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget may approve therefor and such Director shall report to Congress each such limitation determined by him: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the compensation of any officer, agent, clerk, or other employee of the United States who shall divulge or make known, in any manner whatever, to any person the operations, style of work, or apparatus of any manufacturer or producer visited by him in the discharge of his official duties, or the amount or source of income, profits, losses, expenditures, or any particular thereof, set forth or disclosed in any questionnaire, report, return, or document, required or requested to be filed by order or regulation of the Administrator, or to permit any questionnaire, report, return, or document, or copy thereof, or any book containing any abstract or particulars thereof to be seen or examined by any person except as provided by law; nor for any person who shall print or publish in any manner whatever, except as herein-after provided, any questionnaire, report, return, or document, or any part thereof, or source of income, profits, losses, expenditures, or methods of doing business, appearing in any questionnaire, report, return, or document: *Provided further*, That the foregoing provisions shall not be construed to prevent or prohibit the publication or disclosure of studies, graphs, charts, or other documents of like general character wherein individual statistics or the source thereof is not disclosed or identified directly or indirectly nor to prevent the furnishing in confidence to the War Department, the Navy Department, or the United States Maritime Commission, such data and information as may be requested by them for use in the performance of their official duties: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for making any subsidy payments: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to enforce any maximum price or prices on any agricultural commodity or any commodity processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity unless and until (1) the Secretary of Agriculture has determined and published for such agricultural commodity the prices specified in section 3 (a) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942; (2) in case of a comparable price for such agricultural commodity, the Secretary of Agriculture has held public hearings and determined and published such comparable price in the manner prescribed by section 3 (b) of said act; and (3) the Secretary of Agriculture has determined after investigation and proclaimed that the maximum price or prices so established on any such agricultural commodity will reflect to the producer of such agricultural commodity a price in conformity with section 3 (c) of said act: *Provided further*, That any employee of the Office of Price Administration is authorized and empowered, when designated for the purpose by the head of the agency, to administer to or take from any person an oath, affirmation, or affidavit when such instrument is required in connection with the performance of the functions or activities of said Office.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN: On page 10, line 6, strike out "\$165,000,000" and insert "\$130,000,000."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment speaks for itself. It proposes to take \$35,000,000 away from the present appropriation and reduce it to \$130,000,000.

If the amendment is adopted, I would suggest an additional amendment so as

to modify the amount that will be available for local boards, and reduce it to where it was in the current fiscal year, namely, \$37,000,000 plus.

I need scarcely restate the facts I purveyed to the House earlier this afternoon with respect to the investigation I have made of this matter to indicate that if a more efficient technique is developed in O. P. A., not only in Washington but in the regional, in the area, in the State, and in the local offices, \$130,000,000 will be ample not only for the purpose of policing this whole price problem but for making provision for an item that has not heretofore appeared, that is, \$17,000,000 for reimbursement of banks for the services they provide on rationing coupons.

This is one of the agencies that has developed much friction. It is high time that the Congress deal with it in a very fair and forthright manner. I think the gentlewoman from Illinois was essentially correct earlier this afternoon when she indicated that as time goes on these frictions will develop and grow, consequently you will have an expansion of the whole black market idea throughout the country. If a remedy and a cure are to be provided, they should be provided now. It is essential that all of O. P. A. be streamlined at the present time, that they develop a little bit more business circumspection in that entire operation, and \$130,000,000 should be ample for that purpose.

Years ago this sum would be almost unheard of for the purpose of policing the price structure of the country. It ought to be ample at the present time. I respectfully submit on the basis of the case that was made earlier today that \$130,000,000 will be enough and that the House ought to adopt the amendment to provide for a cut of \$35,000,000.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. In considering how much, if any, funds we will provide for O. P. A., permit me to make this observation. There are two or three very definitely fundamental considerations that we ought to take into account. No. 1: Do you want any controls or any effort to control prices and rationing? If you do not, then obviously we ought not to appropriate anything at all, just let it go, and let those who have money buy the food, the clothing, the tires, the gas, and so forth, wherever they can buy it, and pay the highest price for it, and then see if anybody else gets anything that is left—let the prices run wild. Let the food and other rationed articles be auctioned to the highest bidder. Maybe that is the best way, but I do not think it is, and the Congress has not thought so, because we passed and we have on the statute books this price-control law. So, if we decide that we want controls, to prevent ruinous inflation, the next thing to decide is what kind of control we wish to have. If we do not like the kind of organic law that is on our statute books, then we should change the law. The Banking and Currency Committee, if it wishes to do so, can bring in a bill at any time changing the Price Control Act,

making any regulations, restrictions, or changes which it wishes to bring in, but having decided by legislative action that we want this kind of control, then we ought to give them enough money to put it into effect and to carry out the program. I can agree with a great many of the criticisms that have been made. Some of this price control has seemed ridiculous to me, and some of the things have been changed, and as time goes on I have no doubt that there will be other changes. Some methods of enforcement have seemed to be terrible in my judgment. I believe that Mr. Prentiss Brown will try to improve this, but our committee went into this thing carefully, and by unanimous vote of the Appropriations Committee subcommittee, including our distinguished friends on the minority side who were on the committee, they felt this amount of money should be appropriated for O. P. A.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am sure the gentleman would not interpret the view in the whole committee as an approval of everything that is in this bill, and as a foreclosure, without reservation of objection, of the right to offer an amendment.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I have not made any statement that would be by the wildest flight of imagination construed as saying anything of the kind. I said that the subcommittee had heard the hearings on this bill and had decided unanimously that \$165,000,000 ought to be appropriated for O. P. A., and that included the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH], the distinguished gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON], and the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER]. We composed our differences as best we could, and that is the unanimous vote of the subcommittee which had the hearings.

What does this proposed cut do? The bill we brought in here marked \$59,000,000 for local boards, for rationing boards, just where the money is badly needed, and where help is badly needed. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] says cut them out, and give them only what they had this year. That would be a decided backward step in the operation of the price-control program, for the gentleman's motion cuts \$35,000,000 off here, if it carries, giving to the banks \$17,500,000, which we all say is the minimum amount they must get to carry on with the rationing program, and it cuts you down to \$53,000,000 for all of the other activities of O. P. A., when they have eight additional rationing programs coming on. The worst thing Congress can do is to have a price control and rationing act in effect, and leave it in effect, and not give sufficient money to carry out the rules and regulations. If the rules and regulations are not right, then change them, and in many instances they ought to be changed, and in many instances I think they will be

changed, but in good conscience we ought to give them enough money to carry out the rules and regulations that are made to carry it into effect.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I rise to see if we cannot come to some agreement on time on this amendment. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 65 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The gentleman does not propose to cut off debate on other amendments pending on this paragraph?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Then I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 65 minutes.

Mr. TABER. May I suggest that it be on all amendments to that amount, that is, the money in the paragraph.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The amount of money in the paragraph.

Mr. CELLER. Does that mean all amounts in the paragraph? There is a provision in the bill on page 12 that no part of this appropriation shall be available for making any subsidy payments.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. This request does not apply to that.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, would the gentleman object to making that 70 minutes? I was not here in time to stand up when the gentleman first made his request.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Seventy minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the gentleman that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto, and on the amount of money provided in this paragraph close in 70 minutes?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

#### PRICE AND RENT CONTROL NECESSARY

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, as bad as the O. P. A. has been, viewing it from the standpoint of those who consider they have been annoyed and harassed and irritated by the many rules and regulations, this country would have faced ruinous, runaway inflation without the Office of Price Administration or some kind of price and rent control. People who are paying \$50 a month rent today would have been paying \$100 or more per month for the same quarters. At the same time, the landlords who received the \$100 per month would be able to purchase only \$25 worth of what he bought for the \$100. People who are now buying for \$1 the things that they want would probably be paying two, or three, or four, or five dollars for the same thing. Those who have suffered or lost in profits or reasonable returns the most by reason of price and rent control are much better off than they would have been without these controls; since the money they obtain is worth so much more than it would have been worth without these controls.



## IT CAN HAPPEN HERE

In Russia today a half pint of milk costs \$7, if you can buy that milk at all. A suit of clothes like the average person is wearing costs \$450 in our money. A pound of butter costs from \$70 to \$90. Do not think for a moment that such inflation cannot happen here. Who will be blamed if that inflation happens? The Congress will be blamed and should be blamed for it, because it is within the power of Congress to place the instruments and weapons in the hands of the Executive department to stop inflation. If we want to do it we have the privilege and the power of doing it.

## WILL WRECK PRICE CONTROL

This amendment will wreck the Office of Price Administration. So the question is, Do you want price administration? Do you want price control, or rent control, or do you not? If you do not want it, vote for this amendment and you will effectively destroy it and it cannot be properly enforced. If you want price control and rent control, you should vote against the amendment.

## PROPER CHANGES BEING MADE

This amendment proposes a 20 percent reduction at a time when Mr. Prentiss Brown is doing his dead level best to do something in the way of placing more common sense in the administration of that act. I believe he is doing his best and some signs of progress are being made. He is delegating more power and authority to the local offices. He is giving them more rights and privileges to handle questions locally instead of coming to Washington. He has been doing a lot, and I am satisfied from the last few weeks' work of Mr. Brown that substantial progress has been made. If we want to throw a monkey wrench into the machinery and stop that progress, stop that common sense administration, the direction that the trend is now, this amendment would be the most effective way to do it.

## WHO FIRST HURT BY INFLATION

If we have inflation who is the first person that it hurts? The person who is working on a fixed salary, on fixed wages, living on fixed income; the veterans of World War No. 1. There are hundreds of thousands of them who are receiving pensions and fixed compensation, and as we have inflation their incomes will be decreased in proportion. Old age assistance people and other people who are drawing small checks from State and Federal Governments will be the first ones to be hurt. The most effective step that can be taken toward giving them the inflation that will destroy the value of their money will be a vote for this amendment, which will effectively destroy the Office of Price Administration.

## CRITICISM AGAINST ADMINISTRATION

I know there is a great deal of criticism against this organization. I do not believe any Member of this House has criticized it more than I have. I have pointed out their mistakes, and one by one they have shown me where they have been trying to correct those mistakes, and many of them have been cor-

rected. I believe they are making an honest, bona fide effort, and I am willing to trust them, because we must have price administration. We must have these prices controlled or we will have runaway inflation. We cannot determine all these rules and regulations. Suppose the Congress were to attempt to do it; it would be in a worse mess and there would be more confusion than we have now. We cannot do it. We must leave it to the Executive where the power will be to correct those mistakes as they are made.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GILCHRIST].

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Chairman, I believe in the Office of Price Administration, but I rise at this moment to call your attention to the vast sums which the Administration itself wastes.

There is immense and useless expense in the vast volume of printing that the Office of Price Administration sends out and the immense amount of mail that it spews forth upon your desks every morning and out into the mails in penalty envelopes, which increases the expense of the carriage of mails and the postal administration. Most of this stuff is consigned to the wastebasket.

On April 10, I received a release from the O. P. A. It said in effect that a committee had come down from the central part of this country to call upon Mr. Brown; that the committee endorsed the Price Administration; that it endorsed his ideas of keeping things stable; and that it endorsed the President of the United States in his efforts and in his directives, and so on; and the release added the names of 18 farmers who had endorsed the O. P. A. and had made the foregoing statements.

The O. P. A. thought it necessary to pat itself upon the back and to tell how it had been endorsed by 18 farmers in the Middle West. This release said that these 18 farmers had informed Mr. Brown that, while only a small percentage of farmers belong to the Big Four organizations—the National Grange, the National Farm Union, the American Farm Bureau Federation, and the National Cooperative Council—this committee of 18 represented the views of the majority of American farmers. The release told how these 18 men had recently organized at Des Moines what they called the National Agricultural Mobilization Committee. The statement was full of self-praise, of self-adulation, and of self-serving declaration. The O. P. A. was as proud as a peacock in telling about how these 18 men were endorsing the President's directives and especially the acts of the O. P. A.

I was amazed when I received this statement through the mail, because I thought that O. P. A. should not use public money which had been exacted from the people by taxes in publishing and disseminating such a political argument which was purely political and self-laudatory in support of the O. P. A. and of the administration and of the President's directives in regard to ceilings, and so forth.

I was also amazed to know that this organization represented a majority of the farmers of the country and that it had been recently organized in my home State; so I then asked four of the Congressmen from my State if they knew about the organization or had heard of it and found that they had not; neither had I until O. P. A. spent our public money in telling me about it. I thought it was strange that an organization representing a majority of all the American farmers which had been organized in my State had never been heard of by the Congressmen from my State, but such was the claim of this committee of farmers according to the O. P. A. bulletin.

I was also amazed to know that O. P. A. was putting out a statement that the Big Four organizations including the Grange, the Farm Union, the Farm Bureau, and the National Cooperative Council, did not amount to much and represented only a small percentage of our farmers.

In fact, there were so many ridiculous statements in this release that I wrote the O. P. A. to ask about them, saying that I was surprised to read so many facts that "ain't" true. On April 17, in a letter, I told O. P. A. that four of the Iowa Congressmen had never heard of that organization and that it seemed strange that an organization which could speak for a majority of the farmers out there would not be known to our Congressmen. I also asked O. P. A. to kindly inform me for my future guidance just what authority there was in law for them to edit, print, put out, and mail at public expense political propaganda similar to this bulletin. "Is there any such authority?" I asked.

I also wrote it asking if O. P. A. would print and publicize a like statement if I would bring down to Mr. Brown's office a committee of 18 farmers from the Midwest who would claim that they represented a vast majority of the farmers of the Middle West in saying that they did not agree with some of the things that the Office of Price Administration was doing. I thought it would be fair for O. P. A. to circulate both sides of the story, if it cared to enter the field of political propaganda and spend our money in support of the political party now in power. I said, "Will you please do that?" Well, I have been honored with silence. That was on April 17. Then on May 18, just a month ago today, I wrote them another letter, and I said practically the same thing and asked the same questions. I said in effect, "If you desire to be fair with folks, why do you not publish both sides of it? If I bring down these 18 men, will you publish what they say?" Well, I have again been honored with silence and that was just 1 month ago today.

Now this sort of politics is not a thing that the Office of Price Administration should engage in doing. I believe that we have to get along with O. P. A., but let us require it to be fair and honest and upright and not spend so much money in printing party bulletins and in self-laudation and in politics.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I have been saying to the House ever since the beginning of the problem of inflation has come upon us, that the only way to meet inflation fundamentally is by a far more courageous tax program than we have now as well as by a program of compulsory savings in order to bring into balance the available buying power with the available supply of goods.

That is a tough assignment; it is a hard program. And it must have one further part in it—namely to prevent the sale of bonds to banks for new demand deposits written up on their books for the express purpose of buying the bonds.

In the absence of such a basic attack on inflation we are forced to have some program of price control. There is not any other way to prevent vast increases in the cost of living. Yet, we come now to the appropriation for the implementing of that work, and the very able gentleman from Illinois presents to us a proposition to seriously cut the appropriation for the carrying out and administration of that work. He gives us no logical or sound reason why there should be such a cut, except to say that a number of years back we would not have thought of spending this much money on a program of price control. That, indeed, is true, because a number of years ago we were not engaged in the greatest war in history and we were not confronted with more economic problems than any nation has ever been confronted with in the history of this earth as we are today. Once in a while it is apparently important to stress the fact that we are at war.

I could stand here and take up more minutes in very earnest and bitter criticism of some of the actions taken by the O. P. A. in fixing certain prices where I think they have been at fault.

I think prices should have been fixed on the basis of securing maximum production, especially of food production, but that does not lead me to think that you can control black markets or that you can improve this situation by crippling the agency, by cutting down its appropriation below a point where it can have an even chance to do a decent job.

That is an entirely different matter from the question of legislative action to attempt to correct some of the mistakes of O. P. A., as was pointed out by the very able gentleman from Virginia. All over this country we have got patriotic people serving on the local rationing boards. Many are working their heads off and their hearts out and doing it without the help or the paid staff they ought to have, and yet upon these local boards depends the very administration of the whole licensing program.

Sometime ago I sent out a questionnaire to several thousand people in my district. In that questionnaire I asked 33 questions as to the views of the people on 33 different matters of importance to the Nation today. And to the question, "Do you favor rationing?", the answer came back in the ratio of 98 "yes" votes to 1 "no" vote, because people know the only

fair and just way to deal with the problem where there exists a scarcity, is to have such supplies as we do have fairly and justly distributed among the people. For the administration of that rationing program we have got to depend on this organization. And the job ought to be done better, not worse, than has been the case in the past. Yet the gentleman tells us that if this amendment is adopted that benefits will come from the cut. I do not think so; I do not think there is the slightest substance to his argument and I believe that the amendment should be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas made a statement that Congress would be blamed and should be blamed for O. P. A.'s shortcomings and that is exactly what is happening. I went along with the gentleman last year creating this agency. I believed in it. I believed in it then and I believe in it now. However, hundreds of letters are coming to me from my constituents. Here is one you cannot dismiss as moonshine. Here is a letter from a lady with two sons in the service. In this letter she states:

DEAR SIR: As a voter I will let you know how I feel about the Office of Price Administration, just taking large pay for doing nothing about the high cost of living. As a home owner I was forced to take low rent from a tenant who is receiving large pay. I cannot keep up repairs, mortgage interest payments on the rent received before July 1940. The cost of repairs and painting has gone up very much. Food has gone up three times.

Listen to these prices. We have, as I understand, sixty thousand-odd people on the pay roll of the O. P. A., sixty-some-odd thousand, one for every 2,000 people in the United States on the pay roll of the O. P. A., and yet here are the figures, and these prices are accurate because I have checked them.

Cabbage that you could buy in 1942 for 5 cents a pound is now selling for 15 cents a pound.

Sweetpotatoes that were selling for 7 cents per pound in 1942 are now selling for 23 cents a pound.

Spinach that was selling for 5 cents per pound is now selling at 19 cents a pound.

Onions, 3 pounds for 10 cents, now selling for 10 cents a pound. Lettuce that was 10 cents a pound in 1942 is now 19 cents a pound; apples that were 5 cents a pound are now selling at 15 cents a pound; and the lady closes her letter with this statement:

And we cannot buy any potatoes.

I should like to have some Member of this body tell me how to answer this letter and how to answer it so that she will feel satisfied that we are doing something about it.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. When the gentleman writes to her he might tell her that six carloads of potatoes spoiled on the market here in Washington.

Mr. BENDER. And 60 spoiled in New York; \$90,000 worth of potatoes spoiled in the markets of New York because they did not allow the proper refrigeration for these potatoes coming up from the South.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. FLOESER].

Mr. FLOESER. Mr. Chairman, I am not going into a detailed statement of my voluminous criticism against the Office of Price Administration. I attempted to do just that in part on yesterday and those of you who were not here in the late hours last evening will I hope avail yourselves of the Record and read its contents.

I want to correct one statement made here today. The statement has been made that the amendment to reduce, offered by the gentleman from Illinois, in the amount of \$35,000,000 would result in a 20-percent reduction in funds for the Office of Price Administration. This is not true. After this reduction has been applied to the item carried in this bill the Office of Price Administration would still have an 8½-percent increase in funds over the amount of money appropriated to them last year. Last year we gave them \$120,000,000; this will leave them \$130,000,000 for 1944; so that is not an argument in any sense of the word.

I believe that with all of the flagrant abuse of power in O. P. A. some drastic action must be taken. It is within the power of this Congress to at a later date give them new money in a deficiency bill whenever we have found a definite improvement in the policies and the management of O. P. A. Until that time I feel that no Member of the House should take the responsibility of pouring new, good money into a bad rat hole. In my opinion the O. P. A. needs cleaning out from the front door to the back door. Prentiss Brown has had 6 months, but the policies of O. P. A. continue to be the policies of Leon Henderson, and as was revealed in the press of Washington here on yesterday the Smith committee of this House has now obtained some of the secret files of one of the former deputy administrators and general counsel of O. P. A. which reveal that the primary purpose of those who are in control of O. P. A. policies was not to control prices but to control industry, profits, and revolutionize the business of this Nation.

Price control by this administration has been a political mockery while prices have gone merrily on.

Months of intimate and careful study of O. P. A. policies and O. P. A. conditions on my part and on the part of committees with which I am connected in this House have revealed the same thing months ago. Some of the very men, one in particular, who have stood on the floor here to defend in a feeble way the O. P. A. have on repeated occasions denounced the policy of O. P. A. as absolutely and unqualifiedly dishonest. I want to add my word to say that it is the grossest kind of dishonest governmental policy and must be eradicated.



When O. P. A. cleans house and straightens out policy I shall be willing to increase where necessary their appropriations—but not until then.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I expect the gentleman from Missouri referred to the gentleman from Texas, Mr. Patman, who addressed the Committee a short time ago.

Mr. Chairman, I have had my say in the past in regard to O. P. A. and its personnel, and I have felt that when this appropriation bill was up for consideration, it was one time when we could function and give some relief to the American people from the ill-advised reforms and activities of O. P. A. I have several amendments that I am going to offer to the bill. Some of them are perfecting amendments and three are corrective amendments. In this time I wish to read these amendments because I feel you should know what they contain.

The first amendment I intend to offer reads as follows:

*Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the promulgation of orders or directives establishing wholesale prices on commodities and articles to be sold at retail which do not give all retail distributors the full benefit of the lowest wholesale price established for any retail distributor.*

That is to give the small retail dealer the same wholesale price which is now enjoyed by the chain stores and mail-order houses under O. P. A. orders. If you believe in the most-favored-nation clause for foreign nations you should certainly favor this amendment, because it applies the same principle to American citizens who are engaged in the business of merchandising products for civilian needs. In other words it gives equal opportunity to the small independent businessman as compared with the advantages now enjoyed by chain stores and mail-order houses. The small businessman is entitled to equal treatment when you consider his great contribution to the building of our country and the stability which he has given it.

While much has been said in favor of helping small business, little or nothing has been done. When we look at the records, we find that Federal agencies have done about everything that they could to destroy and liquidate small business concerns in this country. Now is your chance to afford a remedy and give some constructive help for the survival of small business. This amendment will give you an opportunity to show your colors if you favor the independent retail merchant.

The second amendment reads as follows:

*Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the compensation of any policy-making officer except the Price Administrator unless such policy-making officer has previously had not less than 5 years of practical experience in the pursuit of business upon which he is to formulate any policy for such pursuit or business.*

I think this amendment speaks for itself.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have an amendment pending at the desk which deals with that subject matter.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I gladly yield, offering this amendment to the gentleman from Illinois, a member of the committee.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. Will it not be a rather lonely place down there at O. P. A. if the gentleman's amendment is adopted?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. We have all been trying to get some experienced men in the O. P. A. to formulate policies. As the matter now stands the O. P. A. calls experienced men from all over the country, ostensibly to advise with them, but when businessmen and farmers come here they find they are not being called to give advice but to be told by the O. P. A. what is going to be done to them.

The third Andresen amendment, which I will discuss when I offer it for consideration, reads as follows:

At the end of the paragraph on page 13, insert the following language: "*Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the promulgation or enforcement of orders requiring grade labeling or standardization of food products, wearing apparel, or other processed or manufactured commodities or articles.*"

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SADOWSKI].

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Miss SUMNER] that I followed her suggestion and I called my wife about this O. P. A. rationing and roll-back to get her views on this thing. Here is what she told me.

First of all I want to tell you that we have four children running from 4 to 12 years. "Our milk bill for the month runs \$35," she says. "If I scrimp and avoid all luxuries and only buy the real necessities we can get by with the rest of the food expenses at about \$20 a week." That is \$80 a month—\$80 and \$35 makes \$115 a month. Besides that, I will go out here like you do and buy my lunch down in the restaurant and maybe a dinner once in awhile, and I spend about \$5 a week upon myself for my food outside of what goes to the family. That makes \$20 a month, which is a total of \$135 a month for food. That does not include the laundry, the children's shoes, clothes, school expenses, and so on. We have nearly \$40 a week for food.

Mr. PLOESER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SADOWSKI. I cannot yield to the gentleman. The gentleman said some things about Mr. Prentiss Brown that I did not like. I know Mr. Brown and every Member of this House from Michigan knows Mr. Brown and respects him. He is a very solid man and there is no comparison between him and Henderson. If there is any man who serves

in this House and he can do a better job than Mr. Brown I would like to see him. I do not know of anyone I would have more confidence in to handle a very bad situation than Mr. Brown.

Now, let us take a working man who is making \$1 an hour. He works 40 hours a week. He gets \$40. Most of them have four or five children in their family. They want to give those kiddies milk, they want to feed them the same as I feed mine. They cannot buy food for more reasonable prices than my wife can and it is going to cost nearly \$40 a week to feed a family of six.

Mr. Chairman, something has got to be done about that. Mr. Brown is trying to do that. You talk about a roll-back. I am in favor of that. I would go further. I would go further than a roll-back on food prices and I would go to the extent—I believe the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] will agree with me—of putting a subsidy on freight. I would put a 50-percent subsidy on every carload of food that comes in, cutting that freight cost on food one-half to the farmer. You take a man who raises a bushel of potatoes, let us say he gets 60 cents for that bushel of potatoes. It costs him another 60 cents to get those potatoes to the market. Then you have the commission men and the men in between who will take another 60 cents on it and by the time we get it to the consumer in the cities we pay \$1.80 for something that the producer gets 60 cents for. I think every Member of Congress who comes from the cities would be in favor of subsidizing freight rates say to the extent of 50 percent of the freight cost, so that a bushel of potatoes would cost 30 cents to ship instead of 60.

I think we ought to get together and avoid this caustic criticism of Mr. Brown and the O. P. A.; they, without doubt, have done a good job. I asked my wife, "What about this rationing and price fixing? Do you think we ought to eliminate this rationing?" She says, "By no means. We must not eliminate any rationing. We would not get anything, the prices would be too high, as was the case a couple of months ago before they set prices and before this rationing went on." Certain foods at that time you could not get at any price. We were paying \$1 a pound for butter before they put a price on it and started rationing it. That is where we would be if we did not have rationing. It is the greatest thing that could have happened to us.

Mr. PLOESER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SADOWSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. PLOESER. When your children and my children next winter do not get enough milk because of the food practices of O. P. A. and the Department of Agriculture, then you go down to Brown and get the milk to feed your hungry children.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Brown has seven children, one of the largest families of any man in this Congress. Mr. Brown knows what it costs to raise a family of children. Mr. Brown is level-headed and he is doing a mighty good job of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL].

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, this Congress has before it today a very difficult problem for consideration, this appropriations bill, in which we are about to authorize the expenditure of nearly \$3,000,000,000 of the people's money to pay the expenses of a number of bureaus, some of which have been doing satisfactory work and most of which have shown lack of ability, lack of accomplishment, incompetency, waste, and extravagance.

Many Members of this Congress would like to reduce, in a substantial way, the appropriations for these various bureaus to a point much lower than has been recommended by the Appropriations Committee, which has held hearings in its attempt to determine how much money should be allotted to each of these various departments. It is difficult, with the lack of information that cannot be given to the House in the short time we are considering this vast appropriation, for the Members to really determine just how much of this money will be wasted, how much that is being asked for is not needed, and it has been difficult for the committee to determine to a satisfactory degree the amount of appropriations necessary for these various departments. Bureaus have been set up and departments extended until it baffles the efforts of Congress to determine the necessary amount of money needed.

I understand that amendments will be offered on the floor to reduce some of these appropriations to a point lower than recommended by the committee. I hope when these amendments are offered, in the interest of the people and in the hope of maintaining financial solvency for our Government, that drastic further reductions will be voted by this body. Members of this Congress generally and the people of this Nation know that there are two transcendent responsibilities resting upon this Congress, whose duty it is to represent the people of this Nation.

Our first duty, as we all realize, is to consider these appropriations and all other governmental matters with the dominant thought first of helping our Government to win the war.

Our responsibility secondly is to reduce, so far as is possible, every governmental expense not essential to the winning of the war. This second responsibility is almost as great as the first, because it helps to accomplish the first duty resting upon the Congress and helps to retain the American way of life which is given to us under our present form of government which we may lose even though we win the war unless we can maintain this country in a sound financial condition.

Here today we have an opportunity to help gain both of these objectives I have pointed out. We have an opportunity to reduce nonessential governmental expenses. We can do this by reducing these appropriations in this bill. We can do it without hurting the war effort and on the other hand such action will aid our war effort.

At this point I want to indicate where we can start in such reductions on this bill, the Office of War Information. Last year this department was given \$35,847,292. This year, running true to form as all bureaucratic departments do, they have asked for \$47,342,000. I note the committee has reduced that amount to \$34,472,504. I want to commend the committee for this action; however, I would like to point out that this Department during the entire World War under the Wilson administration, did the war propaganda work at an expense of only about \$5,000,000.

When the Office of War Information was set up it was for the purpose of propagandizing the foreign nations of the world, particularly with the thought of breaking through to the occupied nations such as France, Denmark, Holland, and others with news from this country tending to weaken the faith of the people in those occupied countries and of the Axis Powers as well, and for the further purpose of giving our slant on the news to all the nations of the world and particularly as a clearing house with the intent of protecting the news channels from securing news that might be detrimental to our war effort and those of our allies. It was charged with the further purpose of giving to the American people authentic news such as could be released, without endangering our war effort to the people of our Nation, so that they might know with as much certainty as possible the facts with regard to our military efforts, failures, and successes on the battle fronts of the world. These are, in substance, the work that was carried out under a like organization that served our people and our allies during the last war at a total expense of something like \$5,000,000.

This like organization, the Office of War Information, has not only assumed those duties but it has gone far afield in attempting to propagandize the people of America in almost every walk of life. It has set up an organization the like of which was never contemplated by Congress and of sufficient numbers to amaze the people of this country. I phoned the Office of War Information this morning to try to get the accurate figures as to the number of people employed in this organization. I think you will be astounded to know, and I know the people of the Nation will be astounded to know, that they have now employed, according to their own statement this morning, as of May 30, 4,496 people.

I believe this following fact will astound the people and surprise many of the Members of Congress. They now have employed 417 aliens on their pay roll, many of them refugees and some of them, I am informed, were employed at high salaries to tell the foreign countries about the glories of the American Government who have not lived in this country for over 30 to 60 days. It would seem to me that a citizen and taxpayer of this country who had lived here and who knew something about the glories of America, to tell to Poland, for instance, could have been employed by Mr. Elmer Davis out of thousands of Polish-American businessmen, mechanics, physicians,

or educators, who could talk the Polish language freely and who could do a better job of selling our Government of liberty to the people in occupied Poland, holding out to them the necessity of them maintaining their morale until the day of their deliverance. The same could be said in favor of our Americans of foreign descent representing the French, Danes, Norwegians, Yugoslavians, Greeks, and other foreign nations.

Volumes could be written in opposition to the wide extension and waste of this organization. It is the best example of bureaucracy running rampant. The answer should be given by the support of an amendment to reduce these appropriations by 50 percent today on the floor of the House, and, in my judgment, it would help to win the war rather than to retard its efforts if half of the money they are asking for is denied them.

Here is another bit of news that I think the people are entitled to know and which will probably astound them. Mr. Elmer Davis, the head of this organization, who was selected by the President, is a former member of the American Labor Party of New York and in 1932 was an ardent supporter of Norman Thomas, the Socialist candidate for President, and was active in speaking and contributing articles to magazines promoting his candidacy. Politically he has been left of the left-wingers for a number of years. Does it not seem strange that the President of the United States, in selecting a man to distribute the news for the Nation to its people, would select a man for this important position whose past political activities have been linked with the American Labor Party of New York and the Socialist Party? Mr. Davis, with the advent of the New Deal, became a militant supporter of this philosophy of government. Can there be any significance attached to the fact that he has widened his scope of news influence far beyond that which was expected of him to the point where he is apparently trying to influence the entire people of the United States on philosophies of government that have no connection with the propagandizing of or dissemination of war news? Can it be possible that his selection by the President was partly due to his left-wing philosophies of government? He holds a tremendous opportunity for influencing the American people in the many activities he has taken over in addition to speaking at Government expense over a Nation-wide hook-up of the air lines once each week. This power should be limited with a serious cut in the appropriations for his department.

Now, another one of the controversial questions coming up in this appropriation bill is the request of the O. P. A. for an increase of their appropriations from \$120,000,000 for the past year to \$165,000,000 contained in this bill. They ask for \$45,000,000 above this amount, but in the wisdom of the committee that additional amount has already been cut out by a vote of the committee. This request gives the Members of this Congress the responsibility of careful thought and consideration. Every Member of this Congress has been anxious



that the O. P. A. organization administer its responsibility in the best interest of the people for the purpose of helping to prevent inflation. The record of this organization is so bad that were it not for the danger of inflation this Congress would not appropriate another dollar for its continuance, but the Congress should and will make sufficient appropriations to continue the O. P. A. in the hope that, bad as its record has been, there is yet the possibility that the Administrator will clear out of this Administration the theorists, crackpots, left wingers, college professors, and a thousand or more of its incompetent, inexperienced dreamers and planners who are attempting to control billions of dollars in business, most of whom have never had any business experience in the matters of which they set up as dictators today. The majority of the men who have been making the policies of this organization are under 35 years of age and have had no experience in practical business of any kind. This organization, if allowed the appropriations they request in this bill, sets up that they intend to increase the number of their appointees to the astounding number of 65,670 persons. They now have, in this organization, 896 economists, 394 attorneys, hundreds of university professors, and out of the whole lot who are drawing the highest salaries, the most many of them have ever drawn in their lives, there are very few competent businessmen who have made a success of their own business.

Here are some examples and some of the reasons why the O. P. A. has failed to meet its responsibilities to date.

The executive over the Nonferrous Metal Branch is an economist and professor with no experience in this line.

The price executive over building material is an oil economist.

The price executive over iron and steel is a college professor. Think of this. It is an amazing situation.

The price executive over Industrial Materials Division is a professor and economic expert, whatever that is.

The price executive over the Paper Branch is a political science professor of Princeton with no business experience.

The price executive over the Machinery Branch is an economist and professor and for the past 4 years has been an accountant. Would it not seem wise in this vast industry if they had brought to the Department as its head someone other than a professor, someone who knew machinery from top to bottom?

The price executive over Chemicals and Drugs controlling the flow and price of this line of goods throughout America, is a Harvard professor with no business experience.

Over the Restaurant Branch is an analyst and economist who formerly was employed by the Illinois Emergency Relief. He has never had any experience in the restaurant business or any other kind of business as an executive.

Here is another one, the price executive over consumer durable goods is an educator.

The price executive over Solid Fuels Division, this tremendous department, is

a 30-year-old Harvard statistical economist, with no experience in business.

The price executive over the Petroleum Branch was a deputy revenue collector, was at one time in the Navy, and for 10 years an auto-finance executive, and he did have some minor experience in the oil business.

The director of textile leather is a Stanford University professor.

The price executive over meat, fish, fats, and oils, over this vast business so important to the people, is an Iowa professor with no business experience.

The price executive for the Food Price Division is 37 years old and an economist with the Department of Agriculture.

Over export and import price control there is a Harvard professor and lecturer.

The executive over the executive office and price department is 35 years old, an economist without business experience who was formerly on the political pay roll of the National Youth Administration and the health and charity department in Denver.

We succeeded in bringing pressure enough to bear recently to have the 34-year-old Canadian-born Professor Galbraith who was the chief price fixer for O. P. A., disconnected from the Department by resignation.

Mr. Porter in charge of rent control is a lawyer, a New Deal economist, a left-winger, a New Dealer who has been on the pay roll for years and who has had no special rent experience.

This is what is the matter with O. P. A. The Dirksen amendment which will compel every policy-making appointee to have had 5 years' experience in the line of business over which he will preside should be passed, and it will go a long way toward supplanting the terrible inefficiency and bungling of the administration of O. P. A. with men who have practical common sense and proven business ability.

I regret that time will not permit me to proceed further. Many other earnest and able gentlemen on the floor of the House have pointed out the great need in the interest of the people, not only for economy but for efficiency in the conduct of the affairs of this Government.

We on the Republican side who are leading the fight to cut these appropriations today have but one main purpose in our mind, that is, to cut out useless expenses, waste and extravagance in the hope of preserving the life of the little businessmen in dealing with the O. P. A., and to try to bring to its management men of experience who can make the O. P. A. program work fairly and justly for all of the people and to strengthen its influence against inflation. None of us want to wreck the organization. We all want to improve it and the way to improve it is not to pour fresh money and greater appropriations into the hands of these incompetent and reckless officials, but to say to them, you may have \$130,000,000 granted you today. Go and cut out the deadwood and the incompetency and run this department efficiently so that you may show the people results and you can come back to

Congress within 6 months or a year from now and you will have no trouble in securing the appropriations that you need.

The holding down of their appropriations and the amendments which are offered and will be offered to compel efficiency in the department is the only manner in which we can ever hope to see efficiency brought to this department which will enable it to use its greatest influence to prevent inflation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK].

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Chairman, The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] a few minutes ago sought to create the impression that because the distinguished subcommittee which considered this appropriation bill had agreed unanimously on the various amounts included in the bill neither the full Appropriations Committee nor this House should have any control over or have anything to say about the various appropriation items.

As a member of the Committee on Appropriations, may I say that I have the highest regard for this subcommittee; nevertheless, it may interest the Members of this body to know that the full committee was given only 20 minutes for the consideration of an appropriation bill for 18 war agencies and carrying a total amount of almost \$3,000,000,000, involving an increase of about 65 percent in the amounts required for these agencies to operate in the coming fiscal year.

Our distinguished chairman of this committee [Mr. CANNON] stated yesterday that wars are not alone won on the battlefield, that we must have industrial production on the home front, and that we must maintain civilian morale. I think everybody will agree with me that the time has arrived when it is necessary to go to some of these battlefronts and bring back some of the men who have been fighting our wars to bolster civilian morale. Nothing has been more ruinous to morale on the home front than the machinations and the manipulations of the Office of Price Administration.

We have been observing a controversy during the past few weeks over whether executive agencies shall expend several billions of dollars to roll back the prices of food products, involving the use of Federal funds to pay subsidies for the benefit of consumers, notwithstanding the fact that every committee of both bodies of Congress which has considered this proposal has definitely stated that it is opposed to the use of Federal funds for the payment of subsidies. This particular item for the O. P. A. proposes an increase of about 25 percent, or 14,000 employees, in the personnel required to operate this agency during the coming year.

No decision has been arrived at yet as to whether Congress will approve the rolling back of prices and sanction the use of funds to pay these subsidies, but today we are told that if we cut a single dollar from this appropriation for

O. P. A. we shall be jeopardizing the program of this agency. Surely Congress still has control over the purse strings, and has the right to limit the expansion of any executive agency. The people expect us to exercise some control through appropriations.

Mr. Chairman, I think the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] should prevail.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am one of those who voted against this O. P. A. bill and voted against it because I distrusted the management that I thought would occur under the administration of Leon Henderson. I am one of those who almost invariably vote for reductions in appropriations. But I think you are approaching this matter in the wrong way. We have had a change in the administration of O. P. A. I believe everybody here on both sides of the aisle will agree that Mr. Brown since he has been Administrator has been trying to improve the situation. The effect of this amendment will be to handicap the present Administrator in carrying out this law in the way it ought to be carried out. I think we would make a mistake in cutting the appropriation for two reasons, first, that it would hurt the program, and second, that if things went wrong the blame would be laid upon you as having failed to give the proper appropriation necessary to carry this program into effect.

This inflation threat is so dangerous, so imminent, and so important, that we ought not to take any chances of jeopardizing this program. I do not think we ought to burn this bridge down because we are mad at somebody, right when we are in the middle of it. I hope the House will vote down this amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a brief observation?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Permit me to say that no Member of this House has criticized the O. P. A. more than I. It is a matter of record that I have repeatedly criticized that organization and some of its policies before the committees and on the floor of this House. It will be recalled that I vigorously opposed many of the impractical regulations, orders, and policies of the former Price Administrator Henderson. I have no apology to make for such criticism. Moreover, I did not hesitate to criticize the present Price Administrator and certain O. P. A. policies when he appeared recently before the Committee on Appropriations. He has been mighty slow in getting his office reorganized. He still has too many impractical theorists in his Washington set-up. Yet, it is only fair to say that the present Price Administrator has ironed out a lot of its troubles. There is still a lot of room for improvement, but that improvement cannot be made by hamstringing the Price Administrator by slashing this appropriation an additional

40 percent. The Committee on Appropriations has already reduced the appropriation for O. P. A. drastically. I agree with the gentleman from Virginia that it would be a serious mistake, merely because some of us may be out of sorts or angry because of some unreasonable regulations of O. P. A. to make it impossible to function in the future as the pending amendment proposes to do.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ROWE. Is it the gentleman's opinion that under the new administration men with the psychology made manifest in the testimony, like Paul Porter, and others, will be taken out of this new set-up?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I do not care to mention any individual, but I think there are a whole lot of people down there who ought to be gotten rid of. I think Brown is in the process of doing it, but he cannot do it overnight. It will take time.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. May I ask the gentleman if he has any hope that we could ever find administrators who would make the exercise of the power of the Office of Price Administration popular among a profit-loving people?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I do not.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK].

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, I think in regard to this amendment as on the amendment on which we voted a short time ago, that we ought not to cripple an institution we ourselves have created. If we have built up an agency and it is not functioning or is wrong, we ought to repeal the law, but I am never in favor and do not expect to be in favor of trying to kill off an organization by an underhanded punch like denying it an appropriation. I think that is a very cowardly way to approach the question.

In connection with the agency that was discussed here just a short time ago, the statement was made that because a lot of men on the pay roll are receiving high salaries it is an extravagant institution, but we must recall that most of this work is emergency work, for instance, like shipping in wood from South America. It had to be done right away. Wood had to be found. We had to furnish this wood for the airplanes and for the fighting ships. It was not a question of taking our time to go out and do that work, or contracting for it; that wood had to be delivered. They had to send experts to South America to find where the wood could be produced. They had to put mills in to mill that wood. They did deliver it.

You cannot tell me that you are saving anything by denying an agency of that kind money enough to operate in this war effort. When the war is over and you have time to think it over, you will

find there are a lot of things you could have saved some money on; but, for example, if you run short of gasoline and the word goes out to get some gasoline, they are going to get it in this country. They know how to get it.

Just because they spent a little extra money in employing experts to make that delivery, I suppose somebody in Congress will stand up and say we are spending too much money, but the things we must have we are going to get, because this country is not going to be defeated, no matter how many mistakes we make.

On this one item of wood, let me tell you what Milo Perkins says about it:

When any of our armed forces are hurled into the waters of the Pacific or the Atlantic, their safety may depend on the life rafts to which they cling. These rafts are made of balsa wood. Great Britain's famous Mosquito bombers, which roar over enemy territory dropping their death-dealing blows, are made in part of balsa wood. Balsa is a vital necessity in the United Nations war effort.

Before the war, balsa was used largely for the manufacture of toy airplanes. No one dreamed then that it would become an essential part of the real thing. Ecuador exported about 95 percent of the total supply.

The World War brought demands for five times the production needed in years of peace. Board of Economic Warfare was given the job of going after this production, and it is getting it. In Ecuador, Guatemala, Nicaragua, and other Latin American countries, Board of Economic Warfare staffs of foresters, millmen, and businessmen are directing the work. Arrangements have been made for mills and dry kilns, and a careful inspection system has been established to see that only balsa suitable for the war effort is shipped to the United Nations. This carefully selected wood is on the firing line.

Mahogany, too, is a war requisite, and in amazing quantities. When I first heard of it, I could think only of decorations for admirals' cabins. In fact, however, not 1 foot is being brought in for any such purpose. The beautifully figured furniture mahogany is not acceptable now. All that may be brought in under Board of Economic Warfare's rigidly enforced program is the straight-grained tough mahogany, which is used for airplane veneers and planking for small boats.

The amount of mahogany which Board of Economic Warfare was directed to procure in a year was almost twice as much as had ever been brought into this country in any former year from the sources which were still available. The Philippines are, of course, in enemy hands. Board of Economic Warfare was told first that it could not be done, but it is being done. The planes are flying, and the boats are being launched.

Established mahogany firms have become agents of the Government, under Board of Economic Warfare's program for bringing in the specification mahogany. This was done to take advantage of their experience, facilities, personnel, and established connections, and to make it possible for them to continue in business. Surveys by experienced foresters were made of lands not normally tapped for mahogany. Mills were set up in the producing countries, so that lumber could be shipped instead of logs, thus effecting great savings in shipping space.

In addition to balsa and mahogany, Board of Economic Warfare has recently been asked to get tremendous quantities of miscellaneous woods, such as yellow pine and ash which are found in Mexico and the Central American countries.

Planning effective programs for the procurement of each of these commodities, presenting different and complicated problems, requires the services of experienced businessmen and technicians. The Board of



Economic Warfare has these men. We must keep them on the job. They are performing a vital service on the economic front of this war.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW] for 10 minutes.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I sincerely fear that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], if agreed to, will strike at the very heart of this vital and necessarily expanding activity which stands between the American people and runaway prices and galloping inflation. Like most of the Members of this House, my admiration for the official conduct of the former Price Administrator was well under control, but I say to you that in my judgment we have now a Price Administrator whose feet are on solid ground, who is actuated by sound philosophy and who I am sure, if given opportunity, will effectuate a very rapid improvement in the administration of that Office, and will bring it into better favor with the Members of this body. I believe we ought not to be too impatient with Mr. Brown. I happen to know from contact with his office that he has in mind plans which will work out undoubtedly in time, which will give a very much better character to his establishment.

I call attention now to what this proposed cut would do to some of the most vital activities of the Price Administration. For instance, to the rationing program. It always is true that many of the most important and startling revelations brought out before our subcommittee of deficiencies are off the record. In this time of national emergency that is especially the case. I am going to show you some things that are secret, or just about a half-way secret, that are in the offing at this time. I refer to eight great new rationing programs. How in the world, if this cut is made, are we going to obtain the manpower to administer those eight great new rationing programs? I call attention to page 178 of the hearings, where there is a sort of ricochet reference to these programs, most of the discussion having been off the record.

The CHAIRMAN. Your departmental personnel has increased from 915 to 1,199, an increase of 284. What is the need for that increase?

Mr. KROEGER. These increases in the national office are in the rationing department, and with the exception of about 13 positions, is all related to the plans of new programs, rationing programs for commodities that we have not yet received specific directives on, but as to which there is some possibility that rationing may be necessary.

The CHAIRMAN. I note that your reference to those new programs is rather cryptic. You list them here as A, B, C, D, E, and so forth. It is pretty difficult for us to get any idea of what you may have in mind, or do you intend for us to have any idea?

Mr. KROEGER. Mr. Brown indicated in his opening statement that it would be preferable not to have these matters generally discussed because of the fact that a discussion of a specific commodity almost is certain to promote the need for rationing. I do not know to what extent Mr. Brown would want me to discuss this program.

Mr. BROWN. We will go into it as fully as you want us to.

The CHAIRMAN. We do not want to go into anything, Mr. Brown, that would prejudice the situation if it should leak out, because in these committees, regardless of how careful we are, information will seep out and if there is anything that would be published that would be of any disadvantage, I would not mention a thing, not a thing, and we do not want to hear it.

The chairman, I think, very wisely agreed it would be well not even to give our committee a definite description of these programs. At the present time 11 articles of common use are on a rationing basis, being set forth on page 12 of the hearings—automobiles, bicycles, gasoline, fuel oil, firewood, sugar, coffee, processed foods, meats, rubber, footwear, and shoes.

It is proposed to add 8 to these, and at the same time it will be necessary to carry on these 11 other programs, which are going programs. Bear that in mind. Our committee cut back the estimate for rationing. The Budget asked for 4,554 persons with a salary obligation of \$12,587,495. We cut that back to 3,726, with a salary obligation of \$10,173,335. The Budget estimated for rationing purposes that there must be a technical and administrative personnel of 2,507, and we cut that to 2,064. The Budget estimated 1,974 for technical personnel rationing, and we cut that to 1,662. With the drastic cuts that we already have made, what will happen to our very vital rationing program, in case the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois is adopted? That is just one phase of the activities of the Price Administration. It applies not only to rationing but to price fixing and rent control. Mr. Brown, voluntarily on his own initiative, reduced the obligations for enforcement of the rental control \$700,000 and has swept off 300 persons engaged in that activity. We have cut down the total number of personnel of Price Administration 3,563, with a salary obligation of \$11,000,000. We have done that on our own initiative.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUDLOW. I have only 1 or 2 minutes, and I prefer not to yield. I hope my friend will pardon me. In connection with the holding down of prices, I call attention to the testimony on pages 240-241, giving the very best estimate of what has been accomplished in controlling prices. It is an eye-opening record. You will find there a statement which reads as follows:

The cost to the Government of World War No. 1 inflation was 13.5 billion dollars. Total war expenditures were approximately \$32,000,000,000, but 13.5 billion dollars of this total was made necessary by price increases. By preventing the pattern of price increases which occurred during the same period of the last war, Office of Price Administration had saved the Government 25.8 billion dollars on the cost of the war by the end of 1942. By the end of 1943, these savings to the Government will amount to over \$70,000,000,000 if prices are held at current levels. This is two and one-half times the total cost of World War No. 1.

That is the estimated saving to the Government, accomplished by price control.

Now, as to the consumer, the statement further says:

Consumers would have spent nearly \$6,000,000,000 more for the goods and services consumed since September 1939 if prices had followed the pattern of the last war. By the end of 1943 the savings to consumers will amount to over \$20,000,000,000 with prices held at current levels.

That summarizes what the Price Administration has done for the people of this country. Even so, with the personnel with which it is now implemented, we hear of black markets all over the country. I wonder how many more of those black markets will be created and how wild they will go if this further personnel cut is made under the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

The gentlewoman from Illinois is recognized.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I do not see that putting an ex-Congressman or an ex-Senator in as administrator of O. P. A. is necessarily an improvement over a professor. At least, you cannot be sure it is an improvement unless you know that he has had some experience as an administrator. I have never heard anybody here say that this particular administrator has had that experience. Certainly there has been no evidence of great improvement in administration since his appointment several months ago. Certainly this administration is using the same policies that Leon Henderson instituted. It is this administrator, backed by the President, who is promoting the roll-back policy that may cause a price decrease perhaps, but will certainly cause a point-value increase, and that is what the housewife is interested in. She is interested in how many points she will have and how much food she can get to feed her family.

You say, "Let the Committee on Banking and Currency bring in a bill." What is the use? The way they have enforced this law does not follow the law. The law told them to stabilize prices at September levels. They encouraged prices to go up. That was illegal, and it is equally illegal to roll them back today, because the law does not direct them to roll back prices. That is not a stabilizing process. That is a disruptive process, which is keeping the corn from going to market in the Northwest, throwing out the feeder industry, shutting down the corn solvent and commercial alcohol industries. It seems to me, in talking to colleagues and asking them how they would vote on a proposition to hold up the funds of O. P. A. until we could get some kind of a practical deal with the administration to get them to change and adopt a workable policy, that the secret of our difficulty today lies in a very fundamental principle of government. It used to be that our Government was simple, that our laws were simple, but I think the O. P. A. shows more than any other example I have seen in the whole complicated New Deal administration that in a republic laws may become so complicated that the people cannot understand them. Congressmen cannot explain their votes

to the people. So today you hear Members get up on this floor and support this bill, saying, "You do not dare to vote to cut this appropriation, because if you do the people would think you were for inflation and for black-market prices and against price control."

I think it is about time we in Congress stop following along noisily but helplessly like a tin can tied on the end of the tail of a mad dog, and by mad dog I mean O. P. A.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired. The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] is recognized.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, the basic argument that has been offered against this amendment is that it will somehow cripple O. P. A. or will somehow injure an agency important to the war effort.

If I understand the situation correctly, the amendment, even after it strikes off \$35,000,000, still leaves the O. P. A. with \$10,000,000 more than it had for this year. What would be the effect of the proposed cut, then, on the program of O. P. A., as offered for the coming year? It would have more money on which to operate than in the year just closing, but it might not be able to extend its activities into new fields. The result should be good for O. P. A. would have to confine itself to essential activities.

There are two ways, it seems to me, in which O. P. A. can save this \$35,000,000 and still do a good job. The first way is to quit worrying about nonessentials and luxuries. Why not let people use their excess purchasing power in bidding for pleasure and luxury items if they want to do so? For example, they were trying to regulate the prices in bowling alleys out our way. I brought it to their attention and I am glad to say that they agreed there was more important work for their investigators than to be doing that, so they stopped it.

Recently I heard where they were spending a couple of thousand dollars fighting a rent-control case where the figures they are fighting are the figures that the F. H. A. says are necessary for the operation of an F. H. A. project and which the renters are willing to pay. Why should O. P. A. spend money to bankrupt an F. H. A. project?

So, I say that if they eliminate chasing windmills and nonessentials and concentrate upon the job of holding prices for the essentials of life they can do a job with the money offered.

A second way to save expense would be to use a less expensive system of price control. There are many instances in which it would be cheaper to use a base price and permit a percentage mark-up than to police every sale. As Herbert Hoover has said:

It is easier to control a shower at the spigot than to chase down every drop of water.

The limited time does not permit one to go much into detail, now, but I have tried to analyze the criticisms and comment that has come to me on the O. P. A. It seems to me that they charge O. P. A. with three things. First, that it discourages production. You who are familiar with the meat situation and the

situation among the feeders and the livestock industry generally certainly know what I am talking about. Feeders cannot continue and will not feed at a loss.

You people who have been concerned about gasoline should have heard Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Ickes, the other day say that he was asking O. P. A. to permit a raise in the price of crude oil to avoid the shortage that is impending. You who come from Oklahoma and Texas ought to know what that means. You know that unless there is a better price for crude oil there will be a greater shortage of gasoline than we have now.

The second thing that the present policies of the O. P. A. do is to demoralize distribution. The small stores in my part of the country have written me repeatedly that they are being advertised and inventoried out of business by the tactics of the O. P. A. That is a subject for a speech in itself but I am sure many of you know to what I refer.

Third, O. P. A. often confuses the consumer and creates the very condition it should seek to avoid. Witness the run on the shoe stores just a few days ago.

Here is a field for price control but the chasing of nonessentials, the discouragement of production, and the demoralization of distribution will result in short changing the consumer when the shortage of food and meat and gasoline and these other things rolls around.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER].

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I rise just to make two statements:

First, I think it is wholly unfair for us to get up here and find fault with Prentiss Brown, who, after all, has had just a few weeks or months to correct the errors that Leon Henderson made. Of course, I was never for Leon Henderson; I think he was misplaced when he was put in; but after we listened to the testimony as to what is being done by Prentiss Brown, I am quite sure that if you could have been on the committee you would have come to the conclusion that he is doing a good job and that he will weed out the undesirable spots in the O. P. A. He is doing a good job today, and is going to continue to do a good job.

Second, Here is enough evidence for everyone in this House to support this bill, I think, without cutting the bill as suggested by the gentleman from Illinois. I am going to repeat what the gentleman from Indiana just stated to you, taken from the hearings in which it is stated:

The cost of World War No. 1, through inflation, to the Federal Government, was \$13,500,000,000.

The cost of the war was \$32,000,000,000.

By preventing the pattern of price increase which occurred during the closing period of the last war—

Get that—

by preventing the price increase, the Office of Price Administration has saved the Government \$25,000,000,000 on the cost of the war by the end of 1942, and by the end of 1943 these savings to the Government will amount to \$70,000,000,000 if the prices are held to current levels.

Surely we will all support Prentiss Brown in the amount of money he is asking for.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. MORRISON].

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask this House of Representatives, and through it as far as my voice will go, the American people, to have mercy upon those fellow men and women of ours upon whom we place this great responsibility found in the O. P. A. It is a terrible, terrible burden to put upon any human being that he should stand between the American people and all those who love gain and profit in this Republic.

Every seeker for gain, every seeker for selfish things in the United States will assail them when they do not do their will. It is a terrible responsibility to put upon anybody, and I say to those who put it on them; give them their loyalty.

Of course, our constituents will come to us; every fellow who is not making as much money as he thinks he should be making, every group, every class that thinks they are not getting what they would like to have or should be allowed, will come to them and tell them and us how bad they are.

They are American citizens, they are great American citizens, and they are entitled to justice as they undertake to save our civilization and sustain those who struggle to keep the flag of freedom flying in the skies of the world.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I agree with most of the Members who say that the O. P. A. has made some mistakes. I think the Congress of the United States has also made a lot of mistakes in its past history. I realize that the problem facing the Office of Price Administration in regulating our whole economy is so involved and so intricate that undoubtedly it will make many mistakes, but I want to point out to my colleagues of this House that there is pent up the waters of inflation, piled high behind this dam, and unless we give to this agency the power to make the dam secure against the pent-up waters, the dam will break and those waters will flood this land and we will be met with the same condition that existed in the last war.

I was in business at that time and I saw \$5 shoes go to \$13.50; \$35 suits of clothes go to \$90, and that is the thing we will face. Yet there are those who are trying to defeat price control and every effort toward control. Of course I realize those who want to engage in speculative inflation want no price control limitations. That is where unbridled inflation will take its place and every consumer in America will lose by it.

The news from our battlefronts as we eagerly scan each day's newspaper becomes more hopeful and encouraging. Our hearts swell with pride as we read of the achievements and victory of our boys in the armed forces.

We Americans are inclined to be over-pessimistic in times of adversity and we



become too optimistic when success seems to be within our grasp. It is not my intention to be pessimistic in my remarks today. My intention is to be realistic and I hope that my remarks will be constructive.

While our boys are winning their military laurels, I fear we are losing in the fight against inflation here at home. This fight is a very involved and intricate one. There are many fronts to be faced. Our General Staff on the domestic front is facing many powerful selfish interests. These interests are fighting for the right to obtain tremendous profits for their great business enterprises. In many instances their desire for profit far exceeds their patriotic impulses.

The farm producers are demanding higher prices, notwithstanding the fact that the average price now far exceeds that of normal years. The wage earners, until the freezing order, have received repeated increases in their total daily earning power.

The great manufacturers and industries have increased their profits enormously. Every increase in price of commodities and wages tends to increase the pressure on the dam which holds back the flood waters of inflation. This pressure must not be increased regardless of which class insists on further price advantages. Unless we as legislators have the courage to withstand this pressure, whatever be its source, the dam will break and the flood waters of inflation will cover the land. The inflation spiral will raise prices of all commodities. The wage earners actual purchasing power will decrease and the speculators' profits will pyramid and the inequity that exists now between the different groups, which seems large now, will be magnified a hundredfold. And after the orgy of inflation, there will come the inevitable aftermath of depression, a depression which will make the depression of 1929 seem tame by comparison.

I seriously doubt if our economy can withstand another severe depression. I seriously doubt if our political economy can withstand the strain of mass unemployment again. And it is because I fear the results of economic chaos which must eventually follow inflation, that I sound this note of warning today. We must hold the line. We must freeze prices, wages, and profits in their present relationship in order that a more inequitable and disastrous result may not ensue. We must not stop, however, at the freezing of present prices which in many instances are inequitable. In order to obtain full production of food and manufactured articles, we must try to solve and remove those inequities as quickly as possible.

Where farm prices are low, they should be brought to parity. Where wages are low they must be raised to the point where they will afford a decent standard of living for the wage earner. Where the cost of production is raised out of proportion to the selling price, this freezing price must be reestablished on a basis of present cost of production. Every manufacturer is entitled to a reasonable profit based on efficient plant operation. Every retailer is entitled to a

reasonable profit for the service he renders the community. Every link in the chain of production and distribution is entitled to a fair recompense for the service which they have rendered society as a whole. When those profits become abnormal or exorbitant, they must be recaptured through renegotiation of contracts or by additional income taxes. During normal function of economic forces in our business world, I agree that subsidies would be inflationary, but I challenge the man within the hearing of my voice to assert that our economy is now operating on a normal functional basis.

Our business economy is no longer operating on the basis of free enterprise and free markets. The urgency of war has changed our economy and interfered with free play of economic forces. In the race against time to build, train, and equip a war machine, we have interfered with the delicate balance of an enterprise.

In order to produce the materials of war, our Government, through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Commodity Credit Corporation, and other agencies dealing with financial subsidization, have loaned to small and great industries, billions of dollars for plant expansion. In many instances these loans have been made with privilege of amortization before profit computation, which will in effect subsidize American manufacturing to the tune of billions of dollars of usable plant equipment in the post-war era.

The farmers have been subsidized through Commodity Credit Corporations and increased prices on farm commodities to the point where their income is the highest in history. The wages of the American worker, through abnormal defense employment, has also increased and this might be termed a form of subsidy. It then becomes necessary to use subsidy for the purpose of rolling back the price of foodstuff to the consumer. If it becomes necessary to use one or two or three billion dollars per year to hold the line against uncontrolled inflation, where can the crime be? Is it not more important to use subsidies to adjust the disparity between the cost of living and the purchasing power of 130,000,000 people, than it is to allow the flood waters of inflation to cover our land? I maintain that it is the lesser of two evils. I maintain that the great portion of so-called white collar class who are ground between the upper mill stone of rising prices and the lower mill stone of decreased purchasing power, are entitled to some consideration. The great corporations of America were not afraid of subsidies when the Government financed their plant experiments on an amortization basis. The farmers were not adverse to receiving subsidies in the depression days before they saw the chance of the uncontrolled rise in food prices—why should we be afraid to use subsidies now to control the dammed up forces of inflation which will engulf our whole economic and political structure if released?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I very seldom find myself in disagreement with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], but this afternoon I feel I must vote against the amendment he has offered to strike \$35,000,000 from the O. P. A. appropriations. I have been exceedingly critical of the administration of the O. P. A. In my humble opinion they have made a mess in the administration of the Price Control Act.

More than any other agency of the Government, the O. P. A. is responsible for the most critical situation we face in our whole war program—the procurement and distribution of food. I feel that Congress has the responsibility of providing ample funds for the proper administration of the Price Control Act. If we fail to give O. P. A. the necessary funds, we must assume our share of the responsibility if the program continues to be a failure. As I understand the situation, most of the increased appropriation for O. P. A. carried in this bill will be used to provide additional clerical help in the local rationing offices. In addition to clerical help, the increased funds will be used for a large number of additional investigators.

In the city of Hartford, with a population of more than 170,000 people, O. P. A. has until very recently, maintained but a single office. Citizens who have to go to that office for information or to secure rationing forms have been compelled to stand in line for as long as 2 hours, on the outside of the door, both in rain and snow. Certainly our constituents are entitled to better service than that. Surely no one will contend that investigators are not needed in the O. P. A. set-up. If black market operations are to be eliminated, O. P. A. must have an adequate staff of investigators.

I believe we should give them the funds recommended by the Appropriations Committee and once having given them the funds asked for, we should insist that these funds be economically expended.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, our hindsight is so much better than our foresight that I hate to say to anyone, "I told you so." I felt sure when we began this program that it was not being started out on the right path. Leon Henderson, however, did not ask me how it should be done and I had little opportunity to impress my views on him as to how to combat inflation. Of course, I feared it from the beginning and fought it.

I told Leon Henderson on the floor of this House once, and twice privately, that I would be willing to vote him a quarter of a billion dollars for a year if he could prevent such a rise in the cost of living happening this time as happened in the other World War. He did not quite prevent a considerable rise but he held it down somewhat, therefore I believe we have made a pretty good investment thus far in O. P. A.

My friend from Pennsylvania has just pointed out from the RECORD, comparing corresponding periods in both World Wars, already we have saved \$25,000,000,000. That is a pretty good return on the investment we have already made

in O. P. A. If we continue to hold the line to the same degree, we will save by the end of 1943 \$70,000,000,000 and we shall win the war on the home front. Even if you do not think we are doing the job very well, remember the superhuman task imposed upon those in charge and the tragic effect upon the war effort and upon the country if no program of this sort is successful.

It pleased and heartened me greatly to hear the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] take the floor here a few minutes ago and oppose the amendment which would cripple the functioning of the O. P. A. The gentleman from Virginia knows better than most of us what mistakes have been made by O. P. A. He is looking into that matter very carefully. He probably realizes better than some of us the calamity of inflation. No doubt the gentleman from Virginia expects under new direction and a better policy for O. P. A. it will function better and more nearly perform the saving work for which it was established. Let us not hamper this agency. I hope the amendment is defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arizona has expired.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me it would be unwise for the Committee to adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois. The entire subcommittee, Democrats and Republicans, have reported out an appropriation of \$160,000,000 for the O. P. A. and it seems to me that with the type of men who are on this subcommittee, the membership of the House on both sides of the aisle can support the subcommittee and grant the appropriation it recommended unanimously. I hope and urge that the amendment offered by our distinguished friend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] is recognized.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] the time reserved for the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 7 minutes.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, the amount in the bill for O. P. A. is \$165,000,000.

The bill carries not less than \$59,500,000 for all expenses of local boards which is earmarked for that purpose in the bill and cannot be used for any other purpose by the O. P. A.

The bill contains \$17,500,000 for the payment to banks for handling purchase authorizations under the ration banking plan and which is an uncontrollable item and would have to be paid by O. P. A. from any fund given it.

The bill contains \$9,000,000 for printing of coupons, forms, and so forth, for all the ration programs which must be done if rationing is to be carried on and

O. P. A. would have to spend it for that purpose.

Total of mandatory and uncontrollable items, \$86,000,000.

This leaves for all other operations of O. P. A. in regional, State, district, area rent, and the Washington office for all expenses, other than local boards, for the rationing, price fixing, and rent control, \$79,000,000.

The Dirksen amendment would have to be applied to this \$79,000,000, in amount of \$35,000,000, leaving available only \$44,000,000.

The cut would in effect be a decrease of 44 percent in the 1943 authorization of O. P. A., not in the Budget estimate. In effect it would reduce the personnel authorized for O. P. A., other than in local boards, from approximately 24,000 to 12,800 or about 50 percent.

This in spite of the fact that there are eight new rationing programs for 1944 and new local price programs to be carried on.

If this is to be done you might as well abolish O. P. A. as to cripple it in this fashion.

If you adopt this amendment, you turn prices and rationing loose and let confusion follow.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The cut that the gentleman is speaking of means to reduce them 50 percent below their present level?

Mr. RABAUT. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. WALTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. What effect would the adoption of this amendment have on the very effective and well-administered rent-control program?

Mr. RABAUT. It would have a drastic effect on it.

Let us take into consideration for a few minutes the group this amendment affects. There are 7,000,000 workers in industry today receiving less than 40 cents an hour. There are in this country on public assistance 3,110,000 people. All of their income is fixed. Number receiving aid: Old-age assistance, 2,230,000; dependent children, 350,000; the blind, 80,000; general relief, 460,000 persons.

In the local governments of this country, excluding the educational system, there are 1,990,000 persons affected who have not had a raise in 3 years and who at the present time must pay an increase in the cost of food of 50 percent. Their general cost of living has gone up 27 percent. So they are taking a cut every day of 25 percent. If you pass the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois you are sanctioning a further disregard for those already suffering under the Price Control Act.

I want to go further if that does not move you. Think about the folks back home of the soldiers at the front. I want you to think about those people. There

we have military allotments to 2,000,000 people with a fixed income. That is \$50 a month, \$12 for the first child and \$10 for each additional child of the family. There are 2,000,000 of them.

Vote for the amendment if you want to, turn them down, turn your back on those who are making the great sacrifices today, 2,000,000 of them back home.

If that does not move you, I want to tell you about the veterans who have been praised from time to time on the floor of this House. You have them in this country, and they have a fixed income, frozen, with an increase in the cost of living of 50 percent on food, and above 25 percent in the general cost of living. There are 860,000 of them in number.

Turn your back on them if you want to today, and vote for the Dirksen amendment to cut this bill further than it has already been cut, the sum of \$12,000,000 by the committee that gave it consideration, a committee that sat for 5 weeks on the war agency bill.

Mr. Chairman, this is serious business. I was happy to see my distinguished colleague from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER] in his wheelchair, a veteran of the last war, say, "I am sorry, I must differ with the distinguished gentleman from Illinois." Yes; Mr. Chairman, in the World War we had a \$32,000,000,000 bill, of which \$13,500,000,000 was inflation. If price control is abandoned and a similar percentage carried on in this war up to the present time, it would be \$28,000,000,000, and if it carried on up to the end of the calendar year 1943, the sum would be \$70,000,000,000 for inflation. The amendment of the gentleman from Illinois should be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired on this amendment.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DIRKSEN) there were—ayes 130, noes 115.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed Mr. CANNON of Missouri and Mr. DIRKSEN to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 149, noes 132.

So the amendment was agreed to. Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one-half minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, after conference with the gentleman from New York, the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, may I express the hope that on the remaining amendments this afternoon we can determine and dispose of them with 10 minutes' debate, 5 minutes to the side.

Mr. TABER. I think we should do that on everything down to the O. W. I.



I do not know whether you can get it as close as that on that particular paragraph, but we can on the current amendment and any other amendments to this paragraph or anything else that I know of.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I express the hope that we can determine all these questions on the debate provided by the rule.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN: Page 13, after line 3, add the following: "Provided further, That no part of any appropriation contained herein shall be used for payment of the salary or expense of any person who, directly or indirectly, pays any subsidy of any kind or character whatsoever, or who directs or authorizes the payment of a subsidy, or who participates in the preparation of or calculations for the payment of a subsidy, or who directs any other person to pay or prepare or calculate or supply information for the payment of a subsidy, or any person who, directly or indirectly, collaborates with, consults, cooperates with, or directly or indirectly aids any other Federal agency for the payment or the preparation of a subsidy; or of any person who engages or participates as aforesaid in the preparation, formulation, or carrying out of any plan or scheme involving the purchase of any commodity by the Government for the purpose of its resale at a price lower than that paid by the Government."

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois is not germane and is legislation on an appropriation bill. The rule under which this bill was brought into this Chamber waived all points of order with reference to limitations that were engrafted on the bill itself by the Appropriations Committee. For example, a proviso was inserted to the effect that no part of this appropriation shall be available for making any subsidy payments. This type of provision was made impervious to a point of order by the rule which brought this bill into this Chamber, but I believe the rule would not preclude a point of order I now make with reference to the amendment the gentleman from Illinois has offered. So I make the point of order that the amendment is legislation on an appropriation bill and not a mere limitation of amount of appropriation nor a mere limitation of purpose of the appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois desire to be heard?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes, Mr. Chairman. The point needs no belaboring. This is purely a limitation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

The gentleman from New York makes the point of order against the amendment that it is legislation on an appropriation bill and that it is not germane. The Chair thinks that the amendment is a limitation and is not subject to the

point of order, and therefore overrules the point of order.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment does five things. It prevents any money from being used for the payment of the salary or expenses of anyone who pays a subsidy. It prevents the use of any funds for anyone who directs the payment of a subsidy or authorizes it. It refuses funds for anyone who participates in the preparation or the calculation of a subsidy. It refuses funds for anyone who directs any person in the payment or the calculation of a subsidy. It refuses funds for anyone who collaborates with any other Federal agency for the payment of a subsidy.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I cannot yield.

Mr. DINGELL. In other words, it is an antisubsidy proposal.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It refuses money for anyone who participates in or formulates a scheme for the purchase of commodities by the Government to be sold or resold at a price which is less than what the Government paid for it.

This last item is included because of the article that appeared this morning and the discussion which has been in the air which indicates that the Government is considering the purchase of commodities to resell to the public at ceiling prices, meaning that a new scheme is now afoot to bypass the interdictions in the law and also to get around the objections that have developed on this whole subsidy discussion.

I need not belabor this point on subsidies. They are a delusion. You pay a nickel on butter as a roll-back. The soldiers and the sailors for whom such great solicitude has been expressed are going to pay it in the generations to come. It is inflationary. Those who have been arguing inflation might well have that in mind, because it simply adds that much money and it depresses prices in the face of the highest pay roll index we have ever experienced in this country.

I think the design at the present time is to develop a real control of business through the O. P. A. Witness the testimony that was given before the Smith committee this week. Witness the excerpts and the extracts that were taken from the private files of the former general attorney for O. P. A., in which it was fairly well spun out, I think, that there was a thesis and a philosophy behind this whole business that undertook a great control over all the business enterprises of the country.

This to me is interesting about this subsidy business. It is not new. Working down in one of the agencies is a young chap by the name of Hector Lazo. He is quite an author. He authored this

book early in 1942, under the title "Subsidies as a Solution for the Squeeze." He says:

Absorbing the squeeze means taking the loss brought about by the price ceiling and, if possible, dividing this loss among all concerned so as to "hold the ceiling" (sell to consumers at the same low price) and still be able to pay higher labor, higher transportation, higher raw material costs.

"Take the lid off of everything else," says Mr. Lazo, who is the original user of that phrase "the hold-the-line order," which is expressed in this article, and who would then put a ceiling on and dip into the Federal Treasury so that we might share the cost all the way around and let those in generations to come pay the bill.

There is another argument against it, and that is the inequality. Consider for a moment the subsidy on butter. The fellow who manufactures less than 1,000 pounds a month cannot get a subsidy. He is in that low class which is not within the contemplation of this subsidy program. Consider the slaughterer who slaughters less than 4,000 pounds of meat a month, or 48,000 pounds a year. He is in that low bracket. He is not in line for one of these processing subsidies.

So it is proposed now under this subsidy program sooner or later to develop tremendous inequalities all over the Nation. It is inflationary, it is illusory, it is unequal. There is the danger that it will harden into permanency just as so many other emergent programs that started out in simple fashion long ago have now crystallized into rigid and permanent law. If we once embark on this, it will be too bad for this country, because it will mean complete control ultimately of the business structure of the country. The farmers do not want it. They have gone on record with their organizations, and this is the time to stifle it by adopting this amendment.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] referred to regulations by O. P. A. and referred to the fact that a slaughterer who slaughters less than 4,000 pounds a month would not come under the regulation, permitting a subsidy. That means if he slaughters one average steer a week, he will come under the regulation, which shows that he is not very much of a slaughterer if he slaughters less than one steer a week. If there are reasons why these regulations should be changed, they can be changed.

On the general proposition of subsidies, ordinarily I am against subsidies. I do not think that is the right approach, but we are now at war, and in some way we must keep down inflation. If we do that, we must control it. We must leave it to the Executive. We pass the law, we grant the authority, and we give a lot of money and make it available, and we charge the Chief Executive with the responsibility of keeping down inflation. There are certain commodities where subsidies work very well, and others where they do not. If we exclude all subsidies, we will make some mistakes;

and if the executive department were to subsidize everything, the executive department would make some mistakes. So let us leave it to the executive department where, if a mistake is made, changes can be made more quickly than they can be made by the Congress. It takes months and sometimes years to change a law. What will this effectuate? The people of New England profited by subsidies to the amount of \$140,000,000 last season, by reason of a fuel transportation subsidy.

In the matter of sugar the consumers profited to the extent of \$58,500,000 by keeping down the cost of sugar to less than 6 cents a pound. During the World War, when we were at this period, sugar was selling for 30 cents a pound. Is not that worth while? Take the case of coal. The consumers profited to the extent of \$40,000,000 last season by reason of the subsidy; and take the case of oil. The consumers profited there. So in some cases subsidies will work and in other cases they will not. So I appeal to the membership of this House to place this responsibility in the executive department and give the executive department latitude and plenty of money and the opportunity to keep down inflation, and when we do that, we will have charged the executive department with the responsibility. Then when we go back home, we will at least have a good conscience, and we will know that we have tried to do what the Constitution and the laws of this country say we should do—leave it to the executive department. We should pass the law and let the executive department enforce the law. I suggest that there has never been a time when we were nearer ruinous inflation, a time when it will take bales of printing press money to buy a loaf of bread, than we are right now, and I do not want to make another step in the direction toward that runaway inflation; and if we do anything to hamstring and cripple and jeopardize the executive department in the enforcement of the laws, and in preventing inflation, we are taking a step in the direction of making these dollars that we are paying the soldiers and their dependents and old-age assistance people, worth a very few cents instead of 100 cents on the dollar. So the thing to do is to vote this amendment down, and let us go into a legislative committee and have a full and complete hearing on this question. Then if it is necessary to have a general law on subsidies, let us pass that general law. Next week, the Commodity Credit Corporation bill will probably be before this House, and in that bill logically this question will come up. That is a legislative bill. Then we can act on it, and base it on reports, and also the printed hearings, but now in this appropriation bill it is not the place or time to say deliberately that the people of New England this coming season will have to pay much more for fuel oil, so that the people in the coal regions will be compelled to pay several times as much for coal, or that the people of this country generally should be compelled to pay 30 cents a pound for sugar instead of less than 6 cents a

pound, as we have it today. I hope the amendment will be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CANNON of Missouri) there were—ayes 147, noes 94.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed Mr. DIRKSEN and Mr. CANNON of Missouri to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 160, noes 106.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN: On page 13, at the end of line 3, strike the period, insert a colon and the following: "Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be directly or indirectly used for the payment of the salary or expenses of any person who engages in or directs the formulation of any price policy, maximum price, or price ceiling with respect to any article or commodity unless such person shall have had not less than 5 continuous years of actual business experience in the particular field of business, industry, or commerce to which the price policy, maximum price or price ceiling in the formulation of which he is engaged or whose formulation he directs, shall apply; but this limitation shall not apply to any act of the Administrator or Acting Administrator as the case may be in considering, adopting, signing, and promulgating price policies, maximum prices, or price ceilings formulated and prepared in compliance herewith."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment be limited to 10 minutes.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I want 5 minutes.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Then make it 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, what is the real trouble with O. P. A.? In my considered judgment, the real trouble with O. P. A. is that those who are price executives and who direct price policies have had no business experience. They have had in some cases no governmental experience, and how we can get real efficacy in O. P. A. unless they have had some business experience and some knowledge of the field in which they are operating is beyond understanding. I shall make my argument from the record. Listen to me, and if I am not correct, I may be corrected. The data I submit are based on personnel information in the hearings.

The price executive over the Nonferrous Metals Branch is an economist, a professor, a consultant, who has had no business experience. The price executive over building materials is an oil economist. The price executive over iron and steel is a college professor. The price executive over the Industrial Materials Division is a Swarthmore professor and an economic expert. The price executive

for the Paper Branch is a political science professor from Princeton with no business experience. The price executive over the Machinery Branch is an economist and a professor and for 4 years was an accountant. The price executive over chemicals and drugs is a Harvard economist and a Harvard professor, with part-time work in the Labor Department, with no business experience.

The price executive, over the Restaurant Branch, is an analyst with 7 years' experience with Macy, an economist, a statistician for the Illinois emergency relief. The price executive, over consumer durable goods, is a sales manager and editor. The price executive over the Solid Fuels Division, is 30 years old, a Harvard statistical economist, has been with the National Resources Planning Board and other Government agencies, with no business experience.

The price executive, over the Petroleum Branch, was a deputy revenue collector, was in the Navy, was for 14 years an auto finance executive, and for a few years in oil. The head economist, of the Economic Analysis Branch, is an economist, a social science research fellow, a Stanford professor. The director of the Textile, Leather, and Apparel Branch is a Stanford professor. The price executive for meat, fish, fats, and oils, is an Iowa professor with no business experience. The price executive, for the Food Price Division, is 37 years old, and was an economist with the Department of Agriculture.

The director over the export-import price control office is a Harvard professor and a Radcliffe lecturer. The executive over the executive office and price department is 35 years old, was a regional cooperative director of the F. S. A., regional price economist for O. P. A. at Denver, regional representative of the National Youth Administration, health and charity department in Denver, and regional labor adviser to the Resettlement Division. Then they have Mr. Galbraith of late memory, from Toronto University, from Cambridge University, and from the University of California. He is a B. S., M. S., Ph. D. He is 34 years old. He was on the National Defense Advisory Committee as economic adviser. He was a professor at Princeton. He was on the National Resources Rationing Board. He was assistant professor at Harvard and Radcliffe. He made public works studies for the National Resources Planning Board, which we liquidated in this House. He was assistant professor in 1938 and 1939. He was a Social Science Research Council fellow. He attended Cambridge University. He has been a teacher and instructor at Harvard, and he has had no business experience.

Now, about Mr. Porter, who directs the rent operations as deputy administrator. He is a lawyer. He is attorney for a string of newspapers. He was a special assistant to the Secretary of Agriculture on informational work. He was assistant to the Agricultural Adjustment Administration. He was counsel for the Columbia Broadcasting System from 1937 to 1942. He was legal adviser to the National Defense Advisory Council. He is a member



of the Federal Communications Commission committee on administrative procedure. He has had no special rent experience.

There is the record. There is what is wrong with O. P. A. This amendment proposes to demand that anybody who formulates price policy for some industry such as the shoe industry ought to have at least 5 years of experience in the shoe industry.

If, in assembling this brief digest of the personnel history of a number of the price executives and directors, I have inadvertently made a mistake, I shall submit my regret in advance. But this digest appears to me to be an accurate statement of the case and indicates that the real problem in O. P. A. is lack of business experience in the key price and directive positions. I am of the opinion that there will never be sound operation of O. P. A. until more business experience is introduced to cope with its present problems. I trust the amendment will commend itself to your good judgment and acceptance.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, the recital of the vocational backgrounds, which has just been given by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], reminds me of an experience I had one morning when I was driving down to work. A man at a corner rode down with me. I learned that he had been placed in charge of a textile branch in one of the new war agencies. I asked him something about his background. I found that he was an investment or securities salesman up until Pearl Harbor. He was away on vacation at that time. When he came back to Washington his wife could not keep house without a telephone and he found that he had to get a job with the Government somewhere to become eligible for a telephone. So this investment salesman became director of the textile branch of one of the new agencies set up here.

I want to direct my remarks particularly to the remarks made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] in his discussion of the amendment of this paragraph relating to subsidies. The gentleman is correct in saying that the adoption of the Dirksen antisubsidy amendment is going to prevent the payment of about a quarter of a billion dollars for subsidies on fuel oil and oil transportation to the East and New England every year. But the gentleman from Texas is not going to meet the subsidy issue by considering legislation that deals only with the Commodity Credit Corporation.

During the hearings on the appropriation bill for the civil functions for the War Department we had a great deal of discussion of the New England fuel-oil situation because of the argument that the Florida barge canal would result in the elimination of the need for that subsidy payment. Mr. Davies, who is the associate of Mr. Ickes in the Petroleum Administration, was before us. I want to read now from page 181 of the hearings.

I asked Mr. Davies about the operation of the pool, and he said:

They participate in the pool, paying into the pool monthly to the trustee that sum which is calculated on the price increase allowed by the Office of Price Administration for its sales of the several petroleum products, gasoline, kerosene, and fuel oil.

Subsequently, he explained, the companies put in their claim for the excess of their delivery costs over the old tanker system. If there is not enough in the pool, the R. F. C. puts in Government money to pay the claims. That is the subsidy and this year it was estimated the cost to the Government might reach well over \$200,000,000.

At another point when I asked who prepared this plan, Mr. Davies replied:

The subject was jointly considered by the Defense Supplies Corporation, the Petroleum Administration, and the Office of Price Administration.

You recall the language of the Dirksen amendment. It would effectively prohibit anyone from the O. P. A. having anything to do with the payment of such subsidies, as the gentleman from Texas has said, and legislation on the Commodity Credit Corporation will not touch the situation.

For I asked Mr. Davies:

Then the Commodity Credit Corporation has nothing to do with it?

Mr. DAVIES. No, sir.

Consequently the proposal of the gentleman from Texas that this matter be handled when the committee brings in some legislation dealing with the Commodity Credit Corporation merely means that nothing would be done about it.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. Does the gentleman recall that Mr. Ickes said he was going to make application for an increase in the price of crude oil?

Mr. CASE. And he has made that application.

Mr. REED of New York. And it has been turned down?

Mr. CASE. That is correct.

Mr. REED of New York. There are 150,000 wells on the front doorsteps of where the oil is needed, in Pennsylvania and New York.

Mr. CASE. Yes; and where transportation is available to get the oil there.

Mr. REED of New York. And the O. P. A. is simply standing in the way of a solution of this question?

Mr. CASE. Yes; by refusing to permit a price for crude oil that will induce oilmen to drill the wells. That is the point I tried to bring out earlier in the afternoon.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] is recognized.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, there is a limit to everything. Certainly we have reached the limit on this amendment. The amendment would completely sabotage the whole price fixing structure. In effect, it would

repeal the law under which the Office of Price Administration is operating.

As a matter of fact, without extensive research it would be impossible to say just what the effect of this amendment would be. No one can say at this time. I think no one would be able to tell without considerable inquiry and investigation just how far reaching this amendment is.

Mr. CREAL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CREAL. What I wanted to ask the gentleman from Illinois I will ask the gentleman from Missouri. If the same qualifications are laid down to be a legislator in this body, how many Members would be here to pass on everybody's business, everything that they know nothing about.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That might prove embarrassing.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I would just like to have the gentleman say whether his understanding of the amendment does not mean that nobody except somebody with a specific interest in the textile business can have anything to do with the pricing of textiles, and no one except a man having a definite interest in the liquor business can say anything about pricing liquor?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. As has been said, it is difficult to accurately construe the amendment and its purport in a curbstone opinion. But there might be that inference.

Why adopt this amendment? The gentleman from Illinois, in support of his proposal, offered only one argument, and that was a list of employees with their background and a record of their previous employment. He did not tell you that the work of these men has been unsatisfactory.

He did not tell you there was any basis of complaint against the service they are rendering; he did not tell you that any one of them had proved to be unqualified or has discharged his duties inadequately. There is no basis at all, upon the evidence presented by the gentleman, upon which we could base any argument in support of this amendment.

If he complains that they are lacking in information relative to the industry with which they deal, it might be pointed out that committees from industry have been organized to collaborate with them in this phase of their work. If the Members of the House will turn to page 54 of the hearings, they will find there assurance that the interest of the industry is to be taken care of, through advisory committees appointed by the Price Administrator. There is an industrial advisory committee, as indicated on page 54 of the hearings, an industry advisory committee on price; and on page 55 and 56 of the hearings, advisory committees on food rationing,

automobile supply, fuel oil, miscellaneous products, and so forth.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, I have a copy of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and it seems to me it goes much further than what he might have intended. He prohibits the payment of any salary of any person, not only who directs the formulation, but who engaged in the formulation. It seems to me that would include clerks and stenographers whose time may be spent in research, and it seems to me the amendment would prevent them from being employed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. This is a pretty carefully drawn amendment. The very words "formulation of policy" was designed particularly to exclude attorneys, clerks, and stenographers. It only applies to directors, price executives, dealing with the formulation of policy, so I think there is not much to the point the gentleman makes.

Mr. GORE. The amendment goes much further than what the gentleman says; it prohibits "payment of any salary of anyone who engages," so that any part of their services or any part of their work on formulating a policy would be engaged in that sense.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, you have got to read a complete wording, and let me say to my good friend, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], it says those engaged in formulating the price policy, and certainly that excludes clerical help and it excludes attorneys, enforcement officers, research men.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, to sum up the whole matter, the question presented by this amendment resolves itself into a question of whether you want a price-control bill or not. It is a question of price control or no price control.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired.

The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The question was taken; and on division (demanded by Mr. CANNON of Missouri) there were ayes 136 and noes 116.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that we will be required to have a yea and nay vote on these amendments I shall not ask for tellers at this time.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN: On page 12, lines 10 and 20, after the word "commodity", insert the words "including milk and the products of livestock."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that the amendment offered by the gentleman from

Minnesota [Mr. ANDRESEN] is a clarifying amendment, I have no objection to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDRESEN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN: On page 12, lines 17 and 22, after the word "act", insert the following: "as amended."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this amendment calls for the same explanation and we have no objection to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN: On page 12, line 13, after the figures "1942", insert "As amended by Public Law No. 729 approved October 2, 1942."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this also is a clarifying amendment. The committee does not object.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN: Page 12, line 23, after the colon, insert "Provided further, That such maximum price or prices shall conform in all respects to the provisions of section 3 of Public Law No. 729 approved October 2, 1942."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment be limited to 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is in the nature of a perfecting amendment setting forth the provisions of the price-control law of October 2, 1942. It simply requires that the fixing of maximum prices be in accordance with the provisions of the law and nothing else. I hope that the chairman of the committee upon investigation will accept it as a perfecting amendment to bring the provisions of the bill down to date.

That is all I have to say, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment which requires some consideration. It is difficult to say immediately just what the effect of it is. In view of the fact that it has not been submitted to the Budget officials or the committee and should have detailed study, I trust the committee will reject the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CANNON of Missouri) there were—ayes 113, noes 94.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN: At the end of the paragraph on page 13 insert the following language: "Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the promulgation of orders or directives establishing wholesale prices on commodities to be sold at wholesale which do not give all retail distributors the full benefit of the lowest wholesale price established for any retail distributor."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment on the ground that under the guise of limitation it proposes affirmative legislation. It is a proposition to restrict executive discretion. It constitutes legislation and is not in order on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Minnesota wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I do, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a strict limitation on the appropriation and is not in the nature of legislation. All it does is to govern the activities of the O. P. A. in writing directives and orders with reference to wholesale prices providing that no part of this appropriation shall be used for the promulgation of orders or directives establishing wholesale prices on commodities and articles to be sold at retail which do not give all retail distributors the full benefit of the lowest wholesale price. Certainly it is in order and I hope that the Chairman will rule accordingly.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I wish to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, for a long time I have noticed a tendency of permitting amendments which are not substantial limitations, but whose only words of limitation, are "provided further; that no part of this appropriation shall be used, etc." or words to that effect. It is a practice which in my opinion is dangerous and which certainly should be limited.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota is in order only if the Chair holds that the words preliminary of limitation used are sufficient to bring it within the meaning of a limitation, for other parts of the amendment constitute legislation. It is a directive to the Executive; it imposes an affirmative duty upon the Executive.

For a long while I have been very much disturbed about the stretching of the precedents in reference to amendments of limitation being held in order upon appropriation bills the only limiting words of the amendment being "no part of this appropriation shall be used," and so forth, the balance of the amendment imposing some new duty upon an official of the executive branch of the Government, compelling him to do or not to do something not provided for by existing law.



I agree with the gentleman from Missouri that under the guise of a limitation this amendment imposes an affirmative duty upon the Executive. Without regard to what decision the Chair may make today, sometime in the near future we must give serious consideration to how far mere words of limitation at the outset of an amendment can be deemed sufficiently limiting to warrant holding in order an amendment which in effect imposes affirmative duties upon some agency of the executive branch of the Government.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. SPARKMAN). The Chair is ready to rule.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] has offered an amendment to be added at the end of the paragraph on page 13. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] has made a point of order against it on the ground it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The Chair calls the attention of the committee to the fact that the language attempted to be inserted by the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota really divides itself into two parts and in order that the Members may understand it the Chair will read the amendment for the information of the committee:

*Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the promulgation of orders or directives establishing wholesale prices on commodities and articles sold at retail, which do not give all retail distributors the full benefit of the lowest wholesale price established for any retail distributor.

The Chair is of opinion that the first part of the amendment ending with the comma, were it offered alone, would be a limitation within the rules of the House and would not be subject to a point of order; but when the latter part is added, it goes beyond the point of a limitation and imposes upon the officials charged with the administration of this act certain affirmative duties and is subject to a point of order.

The point of order is therefore sustained.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN: At the end of the paragraph on page 13, insert the following language: "*Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the promulgation or enforcement of orders requiring grade labeling or standardization of food products, wearing apparel or other processed or manufactured commodities or articles."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment be limited to 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that the gentleman from Massachusetts, the majority leader, made such a vigorous argument on the point of order raised against my other amendment, which only sought to

give the small independent merchants of the country a square deal in their struggle to live in competition with the chain stores, mail order houses, and the Government. I hope at some future time we may have an opportunity to consider the amendment, because if we do not pass such legislation before long most of the small retail merchants will be forced out of business by the O. P. A., and other governmental agencies.

The amendment that has just been read stops the O. P. A. from putting into operation orders requiring grade-labeling or the standardization of food products, wearing apparel, or other processed or manufactured commodities or articles. We have all gone through the fight on grade-labeling. All of you have heard about the standardization of hosiery and how the O. P. A. contemplates standardizing every garment, every food product, and all articles used by the civilian population. Here is one chance to stop bureaucrats in their mad scramble to reform and destroy business and agriculture.

We are fighting a war, and those of us in Congress and a large majority of the American people want to confine our efforts to winning the war. We should stop this attempt on the part of certain officials in Federal agencies of our Government in their determination to reform the business practices of our country. Let them get busy to help win the war.

That is all I have to say on the amendment. I think it is important for the salvation of our system of free enterprise in all lines of business.

I want to cite the illustration of one store in a community in my district, a clothing merchant, who sells a pair of overalls for \$2, the ceiling price. His neighbor, a chain store next to him, sells the same overalls for \$1.47. There is no reason why the man who operates the independent store should not have the same benefits as the owner of the chain store.

Mr. REED of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. As a matter of historic interest, over a century ago they did precisely the same thing, carried on the same type of regimentation in Japan we are now fighting.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. There is no question about it. They want to label and standardize everything, do away with all brand and individuality of product so that there will be no difference between the suit of clothes that you have on and the one that the gentleman from Indiana may wear.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Is it not true that the retail store that the gentleman speaks of that is required to sell the overalls at a ceiling price of \$2 has to pay \$1.58 for the same overalls that the chain store sells for \$1.47?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is correct, and had my other amendment been approved, we would have corrected that situation.

Mr. PLOESER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. PLOESER. Instead of the O. P. A. setting a seller ceiling price at wholesale on these items the gentleman speaks of it has violated the intent of the law and established a purchaser's fixed price, floor, and ceiling?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is correct. This particular amendment is directed more against the standardization and reform effort now being put into operation by the O. P. A., which most of the merchants and manufacturers of the country are objecting to. This is the only chance we will have to correct the situation because there will be no other opportunity for legislation.

Mr. JENSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Is it not also true that the blueprint for grade labeling was drawn a number of years ago in the T. N. E. C. hearings, and even though we may not have gotten into the war we would have had this thing foisted upon us? It is all right in that book, and if you would like to see it I will show it to anybody. It is right there.

The O. P. A. has repeatedly violated the spirit and intent of the price-control law. The law specifically provides against the issuance of regulations compelling changes in customary business practices. My amendment seeks to compel the O. P. A. to observe the law, and I therefore strongly urge its adoption.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the pending amendment proposes to give special privileges and a special status to certain commodities and thereby differentiate between them and other commodities. The chief vice of it, however, Mr. Chairman, is that it proposes to amend or rescind without mature consideration, without study or investigation established regulations of the Price Administration.

I trust the committee will leave the Office of Price Administration free to make its own regulations under conditions which permit accurate and authoritative information on the subject available. I hope the committee will vote down the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CANNON of Missouri) there were—ayes 124, noes 93. So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SAUTHOFF: On page 13, line 3, after the word "Office", change the period to a colon and add the following: "*Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for roll-backs

on any food commodity which has not yet reached parity nor on any commodity which is not a necessity."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Chairman, this amendment divides itself into two parts, commodities that have not yet reached parity and those that are not necessities.

As far as I am personally concerned, I see no reason on earth for O. P. A.'s meddling around with any commodity that is not a necessity. If I want to pay \$100,000 or \$500,000 for a painting, that is my business. Of course, that is a violent presumption; nevertheless, I use it as an illustration. So in this amendment I seek to throw out entirely from the control of O. P. A. any commodity that is not a necessity. Let that follow the legitimate channels of trade. I see no reason for interfering with business in that particular field.

Now we come to the food commodities, clothing commodities, and rent commodities, that are necessities. In relation to the food commodities I see no reason on earth for having any roll-backs on any food commodity that has not yet reached parity. What is the object of interfering, for instance, in my country with the dairy products and the canned vegetable products that have not yet reached parity? All you do by meddling with those food products is to decrease production. We are going to need food. I do not hesitate to go on record here and now by saying that next winter in the big cities we are going to have food riots.

We canned 20,000,000 cases of vegetables in Wisconsin last year. This year it will be at least 25 percent less than that. Too much interference, too much meddling, too much regulation by those who, as the gentleman from Illinois pointed out, have not had the slightest experience in the field they seek to regulate.

We are experiencing exactly the same thing now in our dairy products. Our production of cheese has fallen off very markedly. Our production of butter has fallen off. Yet we attempt and try again and again to encourage interference with these particular products by letting somebody who knows nothing about it set a regulation on them.

All I ask in this amendment is that they let these food products alone until at least they have reached parity.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not have very much to say on this amendment. I think almost all of us are convinced as to how the vote is to go. On every one of the recent amendments there has been one solid vote on the other side of the aisle, irrespective of the merits of the proposition, as it appeared to me. Our friends to the left have decided that nobody but a big businessman can have anything to

do with O. P. A. You could not have an intelligent professor; you could not have an intelligent man in any other line of work. By the amendment which you voted for unanimously, you have said that nobody is competent to hold a job who is not a big businessman and doing the job in the line he is assigned to. You voted solidly for it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I do not think my good friend from Kentucky wants to make a misstatement to that effect. There is such a thing as a little businessman who has some knowledge of a business, and there might be a possibility of the O. P. A.'s appointing a little businessman.

Mr. O'NEAL. Possibly I should not have used the word "big," but nobody but a businessman of long experience, and presumably successful experience.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It could be possible that a grocery clerk might know something about the grocery business, or someone else in that business who worked for an employer might know it.

Mr. O'NEAL. We just agreed to an amendment, which you over there voted for unanimously, providing that anyone who had anything to do with formulating a policy of any kind certainly had to be a businessman. You also voted for two or three other amendments here, which I doubt that I have time to discuss now, but which seem to me totally without logic and totally without reason whatsoever.

In this particular amendment we are again amending the O. P. A. law, the basic law. There is no question about it. You had a legislative committee which considered it a long time, and now you say by this amendment, if you vote for it, and I presume it will be voted for 100 percent on the other side, that irrespective of what the costs are, irrespective of the fact that the farmer or the laborer must get enough out of it to justify his furnishing his services or materials, if the price rises there is nothing you may do about it but let the consumer pay it. This amendment, as I understand, means that you could have no roll-back, you could not stop inflation, you could not stop prices nor reducing the cost to the consumer, which would be ruinous, in my opinion, to the farmer, the laborer, and the consumer.

A vote for this amendment is changing your O. P. A. law. It is making it impossible to stop inflation, it makes it impossible to control the price for the little man, the salaried man, for it is they who are suffering the most today. It is on the theory that there is nothing that we can do about it, and to let inflation come.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I have a very high regard for the gentleman from Kentucky, but I wonder if he really knows what the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SAUTHOFF] is trying to accomplish by his amendment.

Mr. O'NEAL. I think I do.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. All he is trying to accomplish is not to roll back prices until they reach parity prices. I would not embarrass my good friend from Kentucky, but tobacco happens to be 195 percent of parity. I do not think that he would want me to roll back the price of tobacco 100 percent. All we are asking in the dairy business is not to roll back these prices below the parity price.

Mr. O'NEAL. To a point like that, which involves suffering and all that goes with it to the consumer, possibly to the farmer and to the laboring man. This is not the place to do it, by putting a limitation on an appropriation bill. It is not fair to all of those who have an interest in it. The gentleman thinks he is right, and he may be right about it, but I say it is not sound legislation, and it is not the proper thing for this Congress to write a law in that way. I think every group in this country in a time like this should not have its interest so lightly considered as to put a limitation on an appropriation bill and have us say, in effect, we will settle it so that nothing can be done about it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. O'NEAL) there were—ayes 108, noes 84.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CURTIS: Page 13, line 3, strike out the period and insert a colon and the following: "Provided further, That no part of the funds appropriated in this paragraph shall be used to pay the expenses incurred in connection with the conduct of any program or the establishment of any price ceiling which will result in or has resulted in the curtailment of the production and processing of food."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon this paragraph close in 10 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have 5 minutes.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Make it 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, during the past months we have received a great deal of evidence on the floor of the House that the rulings, regulations, and actions of the O. P. A. were curtailing production of food—that they are destroying food. The best authorities agree that we are facing a food shortage. It is the duty of the O. P. A. to lend its influence toward the production of food and not toward curtailment and destruction of food. Vegetables and other foods rot in the field by the ton because of O. P. A. regulations. Dairy cows are sent to the slaughter because of prices fixed by the O. P. A. Dead cows do not give milk, but O. P. A. cannot understand that.

We need food and more food. Greater production is needed to feed our armed



forces, our allies, and ourselves. Anyone who seems to have his ear to the ground at all is aware of the fact that we are facing a great shortage of food. My amendment provides, in substance, that if the theories and practices of O. P. A. are such that they are going to destroy food that exists, or curtail its production or its processing, that O. P. A. should decide in favor of preserving and saving that food.

Mr. HALLECK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. I happen to be one of those who has felt that the O. P. A., in fixing price ceilings, has gone too far in many instances, and in such manner has cut down production. But if I read the gentleman's amendment correctly, it would appear that administrative difficulties would arise.

Mr. CURTIS. I think it could be handled all right. The Food Administration is spending millions and millions of the people's dollars to produce food. This amendment is based on the position that if O. P. A. is destroying the production of food they should stop it.

Mr. HALLECK. I agree that the O. P. A. has, in many instances, been completely out of touch with the necessities of production. Production is of paramount necessity before the country, and we are all for it, but I am not agreed on the language and the breadth of the approach of your amendment.

Mr. CURTIS. The way to have cheap pork products for the consumer is to have more farmers produce a lot more pork. The O. P. A. seems to disregard that. They continually put into effect rules and regulations which curtail production, and the price goes up, we have black markets, and the situation grows worse.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I want to read this amendment for the benefit of the Committee:

*Provided further*, That no part of the funds appropriated in this paragraph shall be used to pay the expenses incurred in connection with the conducting of any program or the establishment of any price ceiling which will result or has resulted in the curtailment of the production and processing of food.

All that amendment, if adopted, means is that you might just as well stop at this part of the amendment: "*Provided further*, That no part of the funds appropriated in this paragraph shall be used." You might just as well stop there.

Mr. CURTIS. Will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. McCORMACK. Certainly.

Mr. CURTIS. I think the gentleman's conclusion is a little farfetched.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman says it is a little farfetched. He does not say it is completely farfetched?

Mr. CURTIS. Does the gentleman believe that the Office of Price Administration should go on and on destroying food?

Mr. McCORMACK. I think the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] very pointedly brought to the attention of the

Members just what the effect of this amendment would be. I repeat that if the gentleman had offered his amendment and used this language: "*Provided further*, That no part of the funds appropriated in this paragraph shall be used," and had stopped there, he would have accomplished the same results as will be accomplished if this amendment is adopted. I do not think the House wants to go too far in adopting amendments. I do not want to get in the position of saying anything which might be construed as lecturing, because I do not like to be in that position, but I think the amendment goes entirely too far.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. TABER. I am afraid that this amendment goes too far. The Office of Price Administration has gone too far itself in curtailing the production of food by the way it has operated, but that would not excuse us for going too far on some things that we do. I appreciate the gentleman's sincerity, but I am afraid this amendment has too many possibilities for trouble.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think that is a fair statement, and I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. CASE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Does not the gentleman feel it would effectively impose duties upon somebody to determine whether or not it would result?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. CASE. Then why did not the gentleman make a point of order against the amendment, under the basis he expounded a little while ago? It is clearly subject to a point of order.

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, I would not want to say that. I do not want to substitute my opinion for the opinion of the occupant of the chair.

Mr. CASE. But the point was not raised.

Mr. McCORMACK. But that stage has passed.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The amendment was not subject to a point of order. It is clearly a limitation and under every rule of procedure it would be in order.

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, we will not discuss that. I am discussing the amendment. It goes too far and I hope it will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH] is recognized.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I think it should be of interest to the House at this time to be reminded of subsection (h) of section 2 of the Price Control Act.

That section reads as follows:

The powers granted in this section shall not be used or made to operate to compel changes in the business practices, cost practices, or methods, or means or aids to distribution, established in any industry, except to prevent circumvention or evasion of any regulation, order, price schedule, or requirement under this act.

It so happens that I am the author of this provision and naturally have an interest in it.

The purpose of this provision is clear and distinct and there is no reason for there being any question as to exactly what was intended when it was made law.

Its specific purpose was to prevent the Office of Price Administration from interfering with the business practices, cost practices, or any other acts that were customarily in use in industry at the time of the passage of the act. The provision was designed specifically to limit the Office of Price Administration to the fixing of ceiling prices and to prevent it from changing any part of our economy.

Mr. Leon Henderson and David Ginsburg were strongly opposed to this provision when it was first offered by me in our committee, the Banking and Currency Committee. Notwithstanding this opposition it passed our committee unanimously and so far as I can recall had no opposition on the floor.

When it reached the Senate it was stricken by the Banking and Finance Committee. However, through the efforts of Senator VANDENBERG, with the permission of Senator Prentiss Brown, as I recall the debate, the provision was reinserted in the bill, with slight unimportant changes, and was then passed by the Senate.

We know that the O. P. A. has violated this provision right and left. It has wholly disregarded it.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. In my investigation and my contact with the officials of the Administration I have found this attitude, that they have utterly set aside and nullified subsection (h) of section 2 of the act.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. That is correct.

Mr. JENNINGS. That is ignored in their regulations, their interpretations, and in their enforcement of this act.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. That is correct. I understand the statement has been made by one of the high officials of the O. P. A. that they felt they had to violate this section in order to enforce the Price Control Act.

Grade labeling, with which Mr. ANDRESEN's amendment deals, is only one of many violations of subsection (h) of section 2, the O. P. A. is undertaking.

If the O. P. A. would confine its work to what the law prescribes it would not need as much money as is requested in this appropriation measure.

The truth is the O. P. A. is using its legal powers and also grossly illegal powers in great measure to destroy private industry and set up a collectivist state.

This is felt by many Members of the House and has been given expression in the reduction of O. P. A. funds requested in this bill.

So that there can be no question as to the intended purposes of subsection (h) in section 2 of the Price Control Act,

I am herewith inserting, with the permission of the House, a copy of explanation I made of it in a letter to Mr. Ed Martin, secretary of the Ohio Newspaper Association, shortly after the Price Control Act became law.

Following is a copy of said letter:

FEBRUARY 11, 1942.

Mr. ED. MARTIN,

Secretary, Ohio Newspaper Association:

The operation of subsection (h) of section 2 of the Price Control Act is intended to be comprehensive and broad in its scope.

The basic purpose of this provision is to limit the operation of the act to the placing of price ceilings, and to protect private competitive enterprise within the limits of such ceilings.

Once the ceiling on any commodity is fixed the concern producing it is free to carry on in the normal manner with respect to all of its "business practices, cost practices, or methods, or means, or aid to distribution."

Only in case of conduct which undertakes "circumvention or evasion of any regulation, order, price schedule, or requirement under this act," shall there be any interference by the Price Administration.

To fully understand the latter phrase quoted above it must be read in connection with other provisions of the measure which are pertinent to it.

Business is free from interference in the management of its operating capital, setting up reserves for normal purposes, allocating funds for the various costs, etc.

Business may deem it essential under the disordered condition incident to the war to devote proportionately more than the usual amount of funds to one or another of its activities. It may be decided to be in its interest to spend more than usual, let us say, for advertising and less for some other purpose. In that event it would be permitted to do so.

This is important. Though the act provides that no license may be required as a condition of selling or distributing newspapers, periodicals, books, or other printed or written material, or motion pictures, or as a condition of selling radio time, this gives but meager protection to advertising. If there is to be adequate protection of advertising, as well as advertising selling agencies, it is necessary to safeguard advertising at its source—namely, the enterprise putting it out. This is one of the specific purposes of the subsection (h), section 2 of the price control bill.

Perhaps one of the most important activities of industry will be that of research. Great demand will in all likelihood be made upon practically all businesses to work out new methods of production and distribution. There is already great demand for substitutes which will likely increase as time goes on. With this provision an enterprise is free to devote proportionately more of its funds to the purpose of research.

Stated in a few words, the basic purpose of subsection (h) of section 2 of the price control bill is to confine its operation to the fixing of prices and to leave industry to run its own business.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired. All time has expired on this paragraph.

The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### OFFICE OF CIVILIAN DEFENSE

Salaries and expenses: For all necessary expenses of the Office of Civilian Defense, including salary of the Director at not to ex-

ceed \$10,000 per annum; traveling expenses (not to exceed \$550,000); and printing and binding (not to exceed \$200,000); \$4,000,000.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time in order to say that I believe that the cut in the appropriation for the Office of Civilian Defense is a mistake. My reason, briefly, is as follows:

The Budget cut what the O. C. D. originally asked for by about three and a quarter million dollars. The committee cut another one and three-quarter millions off that amount.

What does this mean? The cut itself is more than the \$1,600,000 which is the amount that the O. C. D. has been spending for what are called war services. What are those? The war services are things like maintaining the air raid wardens' organizations, a little equipment for them, and things like that.

There are 11,000,000 American citizens who have volunteered their services for one type of war work or another in connection with the program of the O. C. D., men and women like those who have volunteered to work at rationing boards; they are doing salvage work, some of them; they are taking care of children for working mothers, and they are doing any and everything they can find or that the O. C. D. can find in the local communities throughout the country to try to help win this war. Those people are not getting paid. Those are voluntary services, but there have to be a few people and a limited amount of expenditure in order to be able to recruit those people to put into effect such a program. This cut made by the committee is more than the amount of all that work.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. I want to compliment the gentleman for his very excellent statement. What this cut will actually mean is that if any drives come up for salvage or for other things connected with the war, that would have to be set up on a Nation-wide scale, these 12,000,000 or 13,000,000 volunteers who have been working will have been disbanded and there will have to be set up a more expensive organization to supply that service.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I thank the gentleman. That is what I am afraid of. And such organizations, as the gentleman has suggested, will have to recruit people for voluntary service, and each one will have the expense of going out and getting volunteer workers whereas heretofore all such work has been centered in the O. C. D. I do not think that ought to be done.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. Will the gentleman be good enough to ask the chairman of the committee how much unexpended balance remains available for the

O. C. D.? I do not find an explanation of that in the hearings.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I will be glad to have that question asked of the chairman of the committee; I do not have the information.

I am afraid of what will happen under the circumstances. I do know these people have volunteered their services to help with the war effort and they may feel that Congress does not appreciate what they have been doing. I think it would be a very serious thing for such an interpretation to be placed on the action of the House.

Because of the temper of the House perhaps it would not be wise for me to offer an amendment. But I am very hopeful that the other body will have better judgment about the amount required than has been shown here.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment and ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point on the O. C. D.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I have glanced through the hearings on the Office of Civilian Defense, in which I have been very much interested, and I think that the committee is to be congratulated on its recommendation to reduce the expenses of this organization by some \$1,600,000. This reduction, to quote the committee, will "require severe curtailment, if not complete elimination, of the civilian war services."

I do not think that the gentlemen of this House appreciate just what type of an organization the O. C. D. was becoming, and would continue to be, if it had the funds it sought.

Now the O. W. I. in its domestic propaganda tells us that every block in every German city has its block leader, and each block leader makes inspections in every home to make certain that there are no violations of the law, and so forth.

This same block system in Germany collects funds whenever the Fuehrer needs public contributions.

Gentlemen, the O. C. D. has been striving to set up a block system in this country which would go into every home in the land, carrying political propaganda under the guise of official war facts.

What are the thoughts of these men who are directing the so-called civilian war services?

Mr. Chairman, two of the appointed executives of this O. C. D. had the unmitigated gall to refer to elected officials as Little Ceasars, and one of them, a Mr. Lackey, from New England, the home territory of Mr. Landis, said this:

I know these Little Ceasars and I know that they can be "bottlenecks." Believe me, if you have a good live information committee, with a few genuine liberals, they will break these bottlenecks, and pretty quick.

Now, gentlemen, this country has come to a pretty pass when appointed employees on the Federal pay roll make such statements about elected officials. Nor is this the only questionable statement by such employees. This same Mr.



Lackey is quoted as telling other O. C. D. employees:

I think we are eager for the comradeship of fellow travelers in the transition to the extent that I find in the minds of people that are hungry to just not listen, but to raise the question that comes in their minds that they see that need.

Here we see that these people who are officials in the war-service section are eager for the comradeship of fellow travelers.

Once more I say that the committee is to be congratulated in recommending the curtailment of such activities.

This block system apparently has already been functioning in many parts of the country just as these gentlemen proposed. In Chicago, a city of Kelly-Nash fame, which operates some of the affairs of the Nation from the cellars of its auditoriums, apparently is operating successfully in the eyes of these fellow travelers. The morale section holds its meetings in the city hall. They are attended by 450 people. Let me quote what the O. C. D. man reports on this matter. He says that these people—

represent those who are most able to carry on the programs and ideas down into the communities, and finally into the blocks. They have begun on parallel programs in the community. In the blocks, of course, they have always had discussion meetings. The block leader is a type of executive. He is leading on his neighbors.

Need I emphasize that too much he is leading on his neighbors. I leave it to your imagination, gentlemen, just what Kelly-Nash executives would be leading on their neighbors.

But I most heartily congratulate the gentlemen of this committee for what they have done in exposing this type of personnel in what is supposed to be a nonpolitical organization, helping to bring a speedy victory so that our boys may come back home at the very earliest moment.

A year ago we had to step in and abolish fan dancing. This year we have had to step in and banish fellow travelers.

I hope that those people who are running O. C. D. will in the future confine their efforts and the expenditure of Federal funds to civilian defense. When they do that we can be assured that our boys will soon be marching home again triumphantly.

If this organization would spend less time propagandizing, which, after all, is the prerogative of O. W. I., perhaps it could do a better job on civilian defense, and see that the hose sent to the various cities fitted onto the hydrants for which they were meant. A little more concentration on civilian defense would also release needed manpower for essential war services, and I don't mean such civilian activities as the block system of our fellow travelers who would like to break our elected officials while our boys are facing the firing line in all parts of the world.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to see if we can have an agreement on limitation of debate?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph close in 5 minutes.

Mr. BROOKS. Reserving the right to object, does that include 5 minutes to me?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I ask the chairman of the committee whether or not he will answer the question asked by the gentleman from California [Mr. Voorhis] in due course?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I did not understand the gentleman's question at the time, but I have since learned he asked if there was any unexpended balance left in O. C. D. funds. There are none.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Brooks] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I have risen to speak against the domestic propaganda program of the Office of War Information. At the opening of the debate today my colleague the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Woodrum], an able and distinguished legislator, made the suggestion that those with constructive ideas would be well received by the committee which presented this bill to the House, and I present these ideas now as constructive suggestions to the work of the Office of War Information.

Thousands upon thousands of tons of canned literature and propaganda have been sent out for home consumption by the Office of War Information. This propaganda has been sent to every State in the Union, Mr. Chairman; it has come into my home State; it has come into every other Southern State. This domestic propaganda has in many cases, in the South especially, been sent to the county agents whose work is already heavy, whose duties are already burdensome on account of the war, but who have been compelled to distribute this domestic propaganda amongst our people, and thus perform a duty entirely foreign to their normal service to the Government.

Much of this literature, Mr. Chairman, that has found its way into our areas is designed, so they say, to promote better racial conditions in the South. All of the propaganda I have seen has been directed toward the purpose of instilling more patriotism and more loyalty into the people of America in support of their own Government in this war. Mr. Chairman, I say it is the people of America who are backing this war with their taxes, with their efforts, with their sacrifices, and with their own sons on the battle fronts. I submit to this body that there is no need for propaganda to evoke loyalty from our people; there is no need

for this type of literature to try to rouse the zeal and the patriotism of our own people in the United States of America. In fact, I have thought if there is to be any literature sent to arouse the loyalty or the patriotism of anyone, it might be a good idea for some of our red-blooded American citizens back home to send literature to the Office of War Information to raise the character of the service rendered by some of these individuals and to bring enthusiasm and patriotism to their work.

But more than this, Mr. Chairman. Tons of the propaganda which was sent into the South has been a distinct hindrance to the war effort. It has dealt with the racial question. When it has fallen into the hands of the Negro, it has merely emphasized the racial question. When it has reached the hands of the white people of the South, it has resulted in friction, racial disturbances, and riots. At a time when unity is fervently desired by our people in order to win the war, this propaganda has opened the gap between two races of people living side by side in the South peacefully for 200 years, and has brought in distrust and discord. Goebbels, in all of his fiendish role, could not have desired a more perfect set-up than this which is being created in a land which believes unity is desperately needed to win this war.

Mr. Chairman, the money which we are spending on domestic propaganda is wasted money. I hope this Congress will eliminate it from this bill.

By unanimous consent, the pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### OFFICE OF THE COORDINATOR OF INTER-AMERICAN AFFAIRS

Salaries and expenses: For all necessary expenses of the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs (hereafter referred to as the Coordinator), including not to exceed \$30,000 for the temporary employment of persons or organizations by contract or otherwise without regard to the civil-service and classification laws; employment of aliens; travel expenses, not to exceed \$150,000; printing and binding, not to exceed \$12,500; entertainment of officials and others of the other American republics; payment to employees with official headquarters outside the continental limits of the United States, in accordance with the Standardized Regulations prescribed by the President on December 30, 1942, of living and quarters allowances; grants of money or property to governmental and public or private nonprofit institutions and facilities in the United States and the other American republics; the free distribution, donation, or loan of publications, phonograph records, radio scripts, radio transcriptions, art works, motion-picture scripts, motion-picture films, educational material, and such material and equipment as the Coordinator may deem necessary and appropriate to carry out his program; such other gratuitous assistance as the Coordinator deems advisable in the fields of the arts and sciences, education and travel, publications, the radio, the press, and the cinema; expenses of transporting employees of the Office of the Coordinator and their effects from their homes to their places of employment in the other American republics, or from their homes in the other American republics to their places of employment, and return, when specifically authorized by the

Coordinator; travel expenses of dependents and transportation of personal effects, from their places of employment to their homes in the United States or in the possessions of the United States or in the other American republics, of employees for whom such expenses were paid by the Government on their assignment to posts in foreign countries; causing corporations to be created under the laws of the District of Columbia, any State of the United States, or any of the other American republics, to assist in carrying out the Coordinator's program and capitalizing such corporations: *Provided*, That corporations heretofore or hereafter created or caused to be created by the Coordinator primarily for operation outside the continental United States shall determine and prescribe the manner in which their obligations shall be incurred and their expenses allowed and paid without regard to the provisions of law regulating the expenditure, accounting for and audit of Government funds, and may, in their discretion, employ and fix the compensation of officers and employees outside the continental limits of the United States without regard to the provisions of law applicable to the employment and compensation of officers and employees of the United States: *Provided further*, That the Coordinator shall transmit to the President immediately upon the close of the fiscal year a complete financial report of the operations of such corporations; \$30,685,000, and in addition thereto the Coordinator is authorized to enter into contracts during the fiscal years 1944 and 1945 in an amount not exceeding \$18,000,000 for obligations necessary for and incident to his program: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$300,000 of this appropriation shall be available to meet emergencies of a confidential character to be expended under the direction of the Coordinator, who shall make a certificate of the amount of such expenditure which he may think it advisable not to specify and every such certificate shall be deemed a sufficient voucher for the amount therein certified: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding the provisions of section 3679, Revised Statutes (31 U. S. C. 665), the Coordinator is authorized in making contracts for the use of international short-wave radio stations and facilities, to agree on behalf of the United States to indemnify the owners and operators of such radio stations and facilities, from such funds as may be hereafter appropriated for the purpose, against loss or damage on account of injury to persons or property arising from such use of said radio stations and facilities.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, request for the C. I. A. A. amounts to \$33,860,000, plus \$18,000,000 in contract authorizations as compared with about \$37,000,000 in appropriations, plus \$20,000,000 unexpended balance from the President's emergency funds for the current fiscal year. The committee recommendation amounts to \$30,685,000, plus \$18,000,000 in contract authorizations or \$3,175,000 less than the Budget, the reduction being referred to in some detail in the committee report.

The C. I. A. A. has spent some \$75,000,000 since its creation in 1940. I think that money has been spent which it would have been wiser not to spend. I think that projects and programs have been embarked upon which it would have been better not to embark upon.

I think in the past there has been a very considerable duplication of effort.

The committee has been greatly impressed, however, with much of the work which has been done. All of our American sister republics, with one exception, have either severed relations or actually declared war on the Axis Powers. Economic assistance for the war effort and mutual understanding has been furthered.

Furthermore, the committee has been advised that all cultural projects have now been turned over to the State Department. Joy rides for the Ballet Caravan, the Woodwind Quintet, the Yale Glee Club, and the South American Skiers will henceforth be subject to the tender mercies of the Secretary of State.

The appropriation provides for continued radio, news, and motion picture programs on a reduced basis; for a so-called basic-economy program for 2 years, including health and sanitation, food supply and a limited amount of economic rehabilitation; and for a joint educational program to the extent of \$2,500,000. I shall go along with the committee recommendation.

Particular attention is called to the fact that Mr. Rockefeller indicates that he does not intend to request any more money for the basic economy program, that he hopes to put health, food supply, and education on a basis which can be continued without further financial assistance from this country and that he estimates for 1945 a request for an appropriation of \$25,000,000, \$18,000,000 of which will be used to liquidate contract obligations, or about 50 percent of the request now under consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### OFFICE OF DEFENSE TRANSPORTATION

Salaries and expenses: For all necessary expenses of the Office of Defense Transportation, including traveling expenses (not to exceed \$1,250,000, including reimbursement, at not to exceed 3 cents per mile, of employees for official travel performed by them in privately owned automobiles within the limits of their official stations); printing and binding (not to exceed \$250,000, including not to exceed \$10,000 for printing and binding outside the continental limits of the United States without regard to provisions of law governing printing and binding (44 U. S. C. 111)); \$14,650,000.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last words.

Mr. Chairman—

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### TRANSPORTATION OF ENLISTED PERSONNEL

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I take the floor to bring to the attention of the House the fact as I have learned it from the Director of Defense Transportation that in the transporting of troops by Pullman car the Army troops are carried three to a section but the Navy is carried only two to a section. I know of no reason for this discrimination, nevertheless it exists. If they want

to save transportation space the Navy can assign three to a section the same as the Army does.

Following are my letters to Mr. Eastman and his reply on this subject:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D. C., June 8, 1943.

Mr. JOSEPH B. EASTMAN,  
Director, Office of Defense Transportation, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. EASTMAN: I have been informed that in the movement of Army personnel by Pullman, Army enlisted men travel three to the section, whereas Navy men, including Marines, travel two to a section.

Will you kindly confirm the truth or otherwise of that statement?

With my highest esteem, I remain,  
Sincerely yours,

CARL HINSHAW,  
Member of Congress.

OFFICE FOR EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT,  
Washington, D. C., June 12, 1943.

HON. CARL HINSHAW,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN HINSHAW: The loading arrangement for Army and Navy personnel as outlined in your letter of June 8 is correct, this being in accordance with travel regulations of the War and Navy Departments, respectively.

An effort has been made to secure modification of the Navy Department regulations so as to permit more favorable loading in line with the practice followed by the Army, but without success.

With all good wishes, I am,  
Very sincerely yours,

JOSEPH B. EASTMAN,  
Director.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### OFFICE OF WAR INFORMATION

Salaries and expenses: For all necessary expenses of the Office of War Information, including the employment of a Director and Associate Director at not exceeding \$12,000 and \$10,000 per annum, respectively; not to exceed \$50,000 for the temporary employment in the United States of persons by contract or otherwise without regard to the civil-service and classification laws; employment of aliens; employment of persons outside the continental limits of the United States without regard to the provisions of law applicable to the employment and compensation of officers and employees of the United States; travel expenses (not to exceed \$500,000 for travel within the continental limits of the United States), including such expenses outside the continental limits of the United States without regard to the Standardized Government Travel Regulations and the Subsistence Expense Act and section 901 of the act of June 29, 1936 (49 Stat. 2015); expenses of transporting employees and their effects from their homes to their places of employment in a foreign country and return to the United States; purchase of radio time and purchase or rental of facilities for radio transmission, purchase, rental, construction, improvement, maintenance, and operation of facilities for radio transmission, including real property, outside the continental limits of the United States, without regard to the provisions of section 355, Revised Statutes (40 U. S. C. 255) and other provisions of law affecting the purchase or rental of land and the construction of buildings thereon; advertising in foreign newspapers without regard to section 3828, Revised Statutes (44 U. S. C. 324); printing and binding (not to exceed \$2,400,000, for such expenses within the continental limits of the United States), including printing and binding outside the continental limits of the United States with-



out regard to section 11 of the act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111); purchase or rental and operation of photographic, reproduction, printing, duplicating, communication, and other machines, equipment, and devices; payment to employees with official headquarters outside the continental limits of the United States in accordance with the Standardized Regulations prescribed by the President on December 30, 1942, of living and quarters allowances; exchange of funds without regard to section 3651, Revised Statutes; purchase of 24 motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles for use outside the continental limits of the United States, may be acquired without regard to statutory limitations as to price and authority to purchase; acquisition, production, and free distribution of publications, phonograph records, radio transcriptions, motion-picture films, photographs and pictures, educational materials, and such other items as the Director may deem necessary to carry out the program of the Office of War Information, and sale or rental of such items by contract or otherwise to firms or individuals for use outside the continental limits of the United States; such gratuitous expenses of travel and subsistence as the Director deems advisable in the fields of education, travel, radio, press, and cinema; not to exceed \$145,000 for entertainment of officials of other countries; payment of the United States share of the expenses of the maintenance, in cooperation with any other of the United Nations, of an organization designed to receive and disseminate information relative to the prosecution of the war; \$34,472,504: *Provided*, That, exclusive of amounts for unvouchered funds and the contingency fund, not more than \$22,500,000 (including living and quarters allowances) shall be allocated to the Overseas Operations Branch and not more than \$5,500,000 shall be allocated to the Domestic Operations Branch: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding the provisions of section 3679, Revised Statutes (31 U. S. C. 665), the Office of War Information is authorized in making contracts for the use of international short-wave radio stations and facilities, to agree on behalf of the United States to indemnify the owners and operators of said radio stations and facilities, from such funds as may be hereafter appropriated for the purpose, against loss or damage on account of said radio stations and facilities from such funds as may be hereafter appropriated for the purpose, against loss or damage on account of injury to persons or property arising from such use of said radio stations and facilities: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$600,000 of this appropriation shall be available to meet emergencies of a confidential character to be expended under the direction of the Director, who shall make a certificate of the amount of such expenditure which he may think it advisable not to specify and every such certificate shall be deemed a sufficient voucher for the amount therein certified: *Provided further*, That \$5,000,000 of this appropriation shall not be available for expenditure unless the Director of the Office of War Information, with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, shall determine that such funds in addition to the other funds provided herein are necessary for carrying on activities in conjunction with actual or projected military operations.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STARNES of Alabama: On page 26, line 6, after the word "branch", strike out the following words in lines 6 and 7: "and not more than \$5,500,000 shall be allocated to the domestic operations branch."

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to

proceed for 2 additional minutes, 7 minutes in all.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, after consultation with the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], we hope to be able to dispose of this paragraph with 10 minutes on a side in addition to the time allowed the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES]. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate be restricted to 25 minutes beyond the time already allowed the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to modify my pending amendment by striking out in line 2, page 26, the sum of \$5,500,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman's request to strike out of line 4, page 26, the sum \$22,500,000?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. No; \$5,500,000 from the total amount of the bill allowed for the O. W. I.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman desires to strike out the sum of \$34,472,504 and reduce that by the sum of \$5,500,000, and he seeks to strike out lines 4 to 6?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES]?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the modified amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STARNES of Alabama: Page 26, line 2, strike out "\$34,472,504" and insert in lieu thereof "\$28,472,504", and on page 26, line 6, after the word "branch", insert a period and strike out the following words in lines 6 and 7 "and not more than \$5,500,000 shall be allocated to the domestic operation of the branch."

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. No; that is not correct. "No money shall be allocated to the domestic branch." I wish to take \$5,500,000 from the bill and provide that no amount shall be allocated to the domestic branch.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the correct amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STARNES of Alabama: Page 26, line 2, strike out "\$34,472,504" and insert in lieu thereof "\$28,472,504" and in line 6, after "branch", strike out the following: "and not more than \$5,500,000 shall be allocated to the domestic operations branch", and insert the words "no funds shall be allocated to the domestic operations branch."

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I call attention to the fact that when the

unanimous agreement was made limiting time it was in connection with the previous amendment that is entirely different from the amendment that the gentleman now offers. I know that the gentleman from Alabama and the gentleman from Missouri would not want to take the Committee by surprise. It is possible that if the unanimous consent request was made to limit debate to the time it has been, objection might have been made if the amendment had been offered that the gentleman intended to offer. If Members later on desire to speak on this and they ask unanimous consent in the Committee of the Whole I hope the Committee will be tolerant because Members might have objected to the limit on this amendment where they would not on the amendment originally offered by the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I have offered and which was modified by unanimous consent would have the effect of striking from the sum total of the appropriation provided in the bill for the Office of War Information \$5,500,000 and would place a limitation upon the bill to the effect that none of the funds herein appropriated shall be allocated to the Domestic Operations Branch.

Surely the committee handling the bill will not take umbrage at this amendment, for they cut \$12,000,000 plus from the amount recommended by the Budget due to the fact they were not satisfied the amount asked for was needed nor were they satisfied with the efficiency and efficacy of the operations of the Office of War Information as evidenced by their action in cutting the appropriation for domestic operations by over \$3,000,000 or 37 percent. It is an insult to the intelligence of the American people who when this month shall have rolled into history will have appropriated through their Congress more than \$300,000,000,000 for war purposes since the 1st day of July 1940; who have through their Congress voted to tax themselves in unprecedented amounts to say that we do not know why we are fighting in this war. The type and character of the domestic propaganda foisted upon the American people through publications printed and distributed at Government expense by the Office of War Information is a stench to the nostrils of a democratic people. The character and context of the propaganda foisted upon our people by the media of the radio and the screen insult the intelligence of an average 6-year-old.

It is an insult to the patriotism and the sacrifices of the Members of this body and of the American people, whose brothers and whose sons have fallen from the skies in flaming combat, whose sons and whose brothers have gone down to the bottom of the sea with flags flying and guns blazing to await the resurrection call, and to the hundreds of thousands of others who will answer the last call when we invade Europe and roll back the armies of the Axis on a thousand battlefields to say they do not know what we are fighting for until they are told what and why by the Office of War

Information under the direction of Mr. Elmer Davis, of the American Labor Party.

It is more than a waste of public funds to permit the Office of War Information to spend \$5,500,000 to inform the American people why we are at war and how to win it, when we have the only free and untrammelled press in the world to give us the facts without colorization or distortion. We should thank God in our daily prayers for America's free press. It is the strongest guardian of our liberty. When it is controlled by the Government our democracy will perish.

I affirm my faith in the accuracy, character, and truth of the information furnished concerning the conduct of the war and our domestic policies by the New York Times, the Baltimore Sun, and newspapers of their kind. I have confidence in the character and ability of the fine, patriotic American citizens who sit in the press galleries of the House and Senate to furnish the American people with the truth and all the information available on the happenings here. I have confidence in their discretion in handling items from the War and Navy Departments. I prefer my information through a free and uncontrolled press on all phases of life in free America.

Mr. Chairman, America needs no Goebbels sitting in Washington to tell the American press what to publish or the American people why we are in the war, or to give us a colored interpretation of any domestic program. America needs no Virginio Gayda sitting in Washington, D. C., to hand down tinged news of a domestic program or to tell us how or why we should think or act or attempt to influence our thoughts and our actions.

I submit to you that the Office of War Information with its distinct state socialistic tinge has no business telling me or any other American citizen who has sons and brothers engaged in this great conflict why we are at war or how we should look upon domestic programs established by the Congress or set up by Executive fiat in the numerous bureaus and agencies in Washington, D. C.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I will be delighted to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The gentleman is making a very impressive and impassioned appeal, as he always does, and he is very persuasive. The gentleman by his amendment cuts out all funds whatsoever from the Office of War Information for domestic use?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Correct.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. By that token, we shall have no agency whatever in the Government through which the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, the State Department, or the other agencies vitally connected with the war may clear and coordinate their war announcements. Some of those war announcements, as the gentleman very well knows because he has had service not only as a distinguished veteran but on the Committee on Military Affairs, have to be timed. Some of them have

to be withheld in the interest of our cause. They have to be coordinated. I can agree with a great deal the gentleman says about the domestic activities of the Office of War Information, but it strikes me that we must have some medium, some agency. The gentleman does not leave anything; he wipes all of that out. If this becomes law, everything will be wide open to the press. The newsman can get any story he wants and let it go.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. We have the Office of Censorship provided for in this bill. I have confidence in the discretion and the integrity of the American press. I would prefer the judgment and the discretion of the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, the Chief of Staff of the Army, and the Chief of Naval Operations, who are directing the fighting energies of America, as to the character and detailed information furnished concerning our military and naval operations. Certainly, if I trust them with the lives of my sons and brothers in the field of conflict, I can and will trust them concerning news items of the activities of their Departments.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I believe if the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama prevails we may as well tear out completely the provisions for the O. W. I. appropriation from this bill. It would completely sabotage all the good work that may be attributed to the O. W. I. In this gigantic effort of the war mistakes were bound to happen. All wisdom, all perfection could not reside in any official who would head the Office of War Information. Elmer Davis is not infallible. He has recognized his mistakes, he has corrected them. The country was pulling in all different directions. All conceivable selfish groups come down here—all manner and kinds of blocs—and they selfishly endeavor to feed upon the tragedy of this war for their own greed and self-aggrandizement. They strike at all branches of the administration—O. P. A., B. E. W., and O. W. I.

It is essential for the O. W. I. to coordinate information and to tell the people of the country not only something of these selfish groups but what the war is about. The country does not know completely and fully what the war is all about. The aims and the aspirations of the Allied Nations are unknown, unfortunately, to many benighted parts of this country. It is essential, it is very essential, by picture and story, through the movies, through the newspapers, and through the radio to tell the story to the Nation. Mr. Davis and a distinguished array of talented gentlemen are endeavoring to do just that.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. Just what parts of the country does the gentleman think are benighted? All the parts of the coun-

try with which I have had any contact know what the war is about.

Mr. CELLER. Let the gentleman not tempt me for fear that I might tell some places that the gentleman would not like to hear about.

Mr. CASE. The gentleman must speak from his own experience, because I have not found any part of the country that does not know what the war is about.

Mr. CELLER. However that may be, O. W. I. serves an essential purpose, but this particular amendment would destroy every reasonable purpose for which the O. W. I. was instituted.

Not only do we have the sad spectacle of amendments of this character offered, but the Appropriations Committee itself ripped out of O. W. I. appropriations almost \$3,000,000 for overseas purposes. The O. W. I. asked for a contingent fund recommended by the Budget of \$10,000,000, and it was cut to \$5,000,000. I think that was a woeful cut, because as you know, prior to the invasion, any successful invasion, it is essential that pamphlets be distributed to the populace as was the case in Tunisia, Algeria, and Morocco, to win its good will, and the work of the O. W. I. saved thousands of lives of our soldiers. It will be essential for the O. W. I. to do this same thing in the Balkans, in Italy, in Sicily, and it is essential, therefore, that appropriate funds be made available to the O. W. I. for that purpose.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. Yes.

Mr. BROOKS. The amendment does not put a limitation upon the use of funds in foreign propaganda. It is designed to stop propaganda in this country.

Mr. CELLER. I understand that, but one broomstick was put between the legs of the O. W. I. by the pruning done by the committee, and now we are trying to put another broomstick between its legs and the O. W. I. will have a weary time getting along in any respect.

There should have been set up a special contingency fund of sufficient size for the O. W. I. so that it could handle with appropriate secrecy the planning stage prior to the beginning of military operations in new territory and also the activities following after the military operations are under way. We are approaching that tense moment where much depends upon the effective weakening of the moral fibers of the Axis peoples and, on the other hand, the strengthening of neutral inclination in our direction. It may be that before June 30, 1944, the O. W. I. may be called upon to establish new outposts in France, Italy, southeastern Europe, Norway, Burma, the East Indies, and in large areas of China now occupied by the Japanese. It is impossible to estimate the cost at the present time of assembling, training, and equipping teams for these areas. It must be remembered that the cost of north African operations to date rose beyond \$2,000,000 over and above the estimate for the total operating cost for the 7 months following October 18, 1942. Consider the work that must be done



in the operating of printing presses, the disseminating of news, in helping the Army carry on combat propaganda in demoralizing enemy troops.

The success of O. W. I. in the north African campaign is generally acknowledged. Why impede its work in other areas? Are they not of equal crucial significance?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES]. If I thought \$1 of this \$5,500,000 is necessary for the successful prosecution of the war, or that the adoption of this amendment would in any way retard the war effort, I would oppose it.

It is generally agreed by those who know that by December 31, 1944, our national debt will be three hundred billion. The recent tax bill, according to report of the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Morgenthau, will take from the American people in taxes this year thirty-eight billion, and the President is insisting that another tax bill be passed that will bring an additional sum of twelve billion, making fifty billion in taxes the American people will pay in a single year, and none of us know how many billions in obligations the administration has incurred. It is likely the war will last for some time after December 31, 1944, and our national debt will continue to pile up. It may finally go beyond three hundred and fifty billion.

Much has been said about what we would do for our boys when they return from the war. I always place the defenders of our country and their dependents first, and, of course, we cannot do too much for them. One thing we can do, and that is to prevent waste, extravagance, and inefficiency in the expenditure of the taxpayers' money; cut out all nonessentials, and hold down the national debt as low as possible. This great national debt may not affect a person of your age and mine as our activities must come to a close long before our soldier boys'.

I am deeply concerned as to what our boys will find when they return home. In the recent tax bill we entered upon a program of retaining 20 percent of the salaries and wages of the millions employed in this country. There are indications before the war is over this heavy deduction from wages and salaries will be increased. The interest on this great debt will be a problem, and if we continue as we have, when our boys return home they will have deducted from their wages and salaries for many years perhaps as much as 25 percent. They, their children, and their children's children will carry this load for the next 50 to 100 years unless we repudiate. This lessens the opportunities of them and their families to advance in life and to enjoy the high American standard of living.

Most all of the money put in Savings stamps and bonds represents the toil and sweat of more than 40,000,000 workers and the toil and sweat of the American

people for years to come. Every dollar necessary should be spent to win the war, but no dollar should be spent unless it can be justified as aiding in our war effort.

The Office of War Information, and the Agency affected especially by this \$5,500,000 under Mr. Mellett, insist on this money to get properly before the American people the war news and the activities of the hundreds of departments, bureaus, commissions, and other Federal agencies that have sprung up and grown to huge proportions under the present administration. I am convinced that millions have been and are being used by this Bureau and by Mr. Mellett for purely propaganda purposes, to promote the fourth term for Mr. Roosevelt and the activities of the New Deal agencies, and to continue them in power for another 4 years.

I agree with the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES] and other prominent Democrats of this House who have approved this amendment, that this sum of money is not necessary or essential in fighting the war. We must fearlessly do our duty and save every dollar of burden to the American taxpayer and to the future generations of our country.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], who opposes this amendment, says this money is needed as there are some remote districts or rather benighted sections of this country that do not know about the war or what we are fighting for. They know all about this war in my district and in Kentucky and what we are fighting about and for, and I am satisfied the people of Mr. CELLER's district, in the great city of New York, with their great newspapers, radio stations, and radios know about the war and what we are fighting about and for. In practically every family of this Nation there is some father, son, daughter, cousin, nephew, or uncle in our armed service. All of these families know about this war. Anyhow, whatever information Mr. Davis or Mr. Mellett, of the O. W. I., give out it must come through the War and Navy Departments. I would rather take my information from the reports put out by the War and Navy Departments and by the many able and disinterested radio broadcasting stations and the newspapers. They are less biased than Mr. Davis and Mr. Mellett. They do not owe their jobs to Mr. Roosevelt or to any of his departments, bureaus, or commissions, and most of them are not interested in perpetuating Mr. Roosevelt in office or continuing the New Deal in power.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Yes.

Mr. JENNINGS. Is it not a fact that in every nook and corner of this country, in the window of every home, there is a service flag with a star on it, all the way from 1 to 6 or 10 to 12, representing the number of that family in the armed service?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Why, yes; but the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], who is a New Deal partisan, wants some excuse for being for this agency. This is a useless, wasteful ex-

penditure of the people's money, and the gentleman from New York ought to get up some better excuse than that which he offers.

Mr. KNOTSON. Was it not rather humiliating for the Congress of this country to get our information regarding the war from Mr. Churchill, who told us things that we had not heard about in our own newspapers probably because the opinion had been stressed to Mr. Churchill that we ought to know about it.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Davis no doubt had not consulted Mr. Churchill.

Mr. CASE. If there is a service flag in every window, as the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS] has said, I am wondering if the gentleman from Kentucky thinks there is anything that could be put out by this Bureau of War Information that would make the people any more informed about the war?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Certainly not. We are all tired of wasting money for this political propaganda.

#### FOURTH TERM AND POWER

There is no doubt in the mind of any well-informed person on the political situation in this country that Mr. Roosevelt is a candidate for the fourth term. Mr. Walker, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, having projected Mr. Roosevelt's candidacy some months ago, later on urged we have a short campaign in 1944. That was followed up by a statement of the First Lady of the land, Mrs. Roosevelt, on June 15, 1943, in which she delivered herself as follows:

Of course, I think it would be a great step forward if the Government allowed all candidates to spend exactly the same amount and give them so much time on the radio and so much newspaper-advertising space and so much gas for traveling and actually meeting the people. It would be a good thing if this expense came out of our taxes.

For more than 11 years the administration has regimented, by use of patronage, the taxpayers' money, and other blandishments, agriculture, labor, and industry. Now, the First Lady of the land would regiment candidates and political parties, the radios, newspaper-advertising space, and the amount of money and gas expended and used in traveling to actually meet the people, and she said it would be a good thing if this expense came out of our taxes.

Mr. Davis, of the O. W. I., with the millions at his command and the power given him, exercises tremendous influence over the radios, newspapers, picture shows, and so forth, and Mr. Mellett, as supervisor of the radios, newspapers, propaganda issued by all the departments and agencies of the Government, and the picture shows of the country, has tremendous power. He, like Mr. Davis, is a strong new dealer. He, like Mr. Davis, will use these instrumentalities, in my opinion, to accomplish the ambitions of the President for a fourth term and continue the New Deal in power, with its 3,008,000 officeholders, and the policies, regulations, and directives of these New Deal agencies and activities.

This \$5,500,000 will carry with it the control over radios, the picture shows,

and all this propaganda, and will become a tremendous force and power in political campaigns that are ahead of us. It would mean the administration through these agencies could secure, as they have in the past, millions and millions of dollars of free publicity from the press and from all the departments and agencies of the Government and this propaganda put out to mislead and deceive the American people as to the true facts and conditions of their Government and the economic life of the Nation, and I am not surprised to see the stalwarts of the New Deal fighting tooth and toenail against the Starnes amendment to keep this \$5,500,000 in the bill, together with the control that would give to the administration of millions and millions of dollars of free advertising.

Of course, these agencies would not be at the disposal of the opponent of the President or his party. His close friends and associates would be in charge of all this. It would all be put out, as it has been, under the guise of aiding the war. Through the films of the various picture shows of the Nation that are run free for the Government tens of millions of people would be reached every week, and these films are shown at factories, parent-teachers associations, student bodies, and they do not overlook a bet in getting this free stuff before the people of the Nation. The President has access to the press a private citizen would not have. If he makes a purely partisan political speech yet it is carried by all the papers with the President's picture and also by radio. If he makes a partisan political appeal with a Nation-wide hook-up, and if this amendment is not agreed to, the press, the radios, and the shows will be used to promote the fourth term and the candidates approved by the President and his New Deal associates.

Of course, the candidacy for a fourth term has been going on and will continue unabated until November 1944. It was clever of Mr. Walker in urging the Republicans to make a short campaign, and it was exceedingly clever of Mrs. Roosevelt to limit the amount of space any candidate could use on the radio and in the newspapers and the amount of money to be expended for traveling. In addition to the other advantages, the President has at his disposal \$35,000 annually of the taxpayers' money for traveling expenses and speech making, and it was very natural for the First Lady of the Land to suggest that expenses of candidates be taken out of the pockets of the taxpayers. The New Deal has been doing that in every election since 1933. They have spent billions and billions on some form or other of benefits or relief, and the voters in primaries and in final elections have been browbeaten and intimidated and in many instances made to believe they would lose these benefits if they did not support the candidates of the New Deal.

This \$5,500,000 would be used in an attempt to popularize the New Deal and their policies and to promote the political fortunes of the New Deal candidates. The administration does not lose an opportunity in expending the tax-

payors' money to try to influence the voters to back up the New Deal, its candidates, and policies.

We are fighting a great war. The fourth term should not have been projected into this situation. I propose to fight to eliminate every dollar that will not promote our war effort and benefit the American people. Mr. Mellett knows how to put the heat on. Some time ago he sent a letter to the picture producers in which he demanded the O. W. I. "receive copies or synopses of all stories which you contemplate producing and of the finished scripts." He undertakes to censor the pictures. This demand created consternation among the motion-picture producers of the Nation. A typical reaction is that of Mr. Walter Wanger, president of the Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences, one of Hollywood's most distinguished motion-picture producers, who wrote in the current issue of Public Opinion:

These requests cause apprehension inside the industry. Outside editors generally took the position that a threat to freedom of speech in one medium affected all. The conclusion is logical and sums the national mind. Censorship before utterance is abhorrent to Americans who believe that autocracy can have no deadlier weapon than a blue pencil.

The power of Mr. Davis and Mr. Mellett is such that they have been able to secure the endorsement of their program by some of the picture producers of the country. These men have the power under their regulations to make or break most any picture producer. If their efforts were confined solely and only to the war effort and in trying to win the war instead of trying to win the election in 1944, it would be different.

Millions of dollars have been used annually to get out propaganda matter by the great multitude of bureaus, commissions and other agencies of the Government, which is sent out to the American people attempting to glorify the countless regulations and directives of these agencies, oppressing the American people and confusing the economic life of the Nation, and cutting down instead of aiding production and hindering rather than helping the war effort.

Believing that this \$5,500,000 will be used for political purposes and to promote the fourth term of the President and a continuance of the bureaucratic control in Washington and the unwise policies of the New Deal, I am against this item in the appropriations bill, and I hope it will be eliminated.

I was glad to be present and have an opportunity to cut thirty-five million from the O. P. A. appropriations and to require persons in that agency to have the qualifications necessary to do a sensible, practicable, and reasonable job, and to vote for amendments that will cut out a lot of the confusion and hardships of rationing. The American people are willing to undergo any hardship that is necessary to win the war, but they do not desire their lives and businesses wrecked by a lot of impractical crackpots who find lodgment by the hundreds of thousands in these New Deal agencies of the Government.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to take away anything from any agency that is necessary in the war effort. I want the various agencies of government to have such funds as will contribute to the war effort. It is well to examine an appropriation in that light at this time. We are dealing here with domestic propaganda.

I fail to see where it will help the war effort to fill our own land here with all sorts of propaganda. Propaganda probably has a proper place, but surely it has not come to the point that we need to flood the Nation with it. Its proper place is in foreign lands, not here.

Our people at home are making every sacrifice. They are toiling early and late. They have seen their sons and daughters march off to war, to foreign lands, some never to return. The fathers, mothers, and wives do not need Elmer Davis to remind them of the sacrifices they are already making. Do the men and women in the military and naval services need Elmer Davis, a member of the radical American Labor Party in New York, to tell them about the war? My sons overseas do not need this man to tell them about the war. They know, and millions of others also know. The ridiculous part of it is that much of this propaganda is being prepared in this office by and under the supervision of aliens, some of whom have been here only a short time, telling our people in America what they should do, and so forth.

Elmer Davis, instead of helping the war effort domestically, I think, is hurting it. The propaganda which he has put out in the form of pamphlets and otherwise has done a great deal to foment unrest, to create disunity, and to make the minority problem worse, much worse. His propaganda stuff has hurt the South. We have a serious racial problem in this Nation. We in the South understand that problem and know best how to deal with it. We understand the psychology of the race problem. Davis had 2,500,000 copies of a certain pamphlet printed and sent everywhere. This was done with the taxpayers' money. This pamphlet undertook to glorify one race in the war. We in the South wish to encourage that race. We are the best friends of that race. But such propaganda raises a race issue, which ought to be kept down. We want unity in this country. All over this country now we are having race riots, even in the North, and the type of propaganda which the O. W. I. has been sending out certainly does not hold that situation down. I tell you as a father, who has his all in this war, that we do not want anything that will create disunity. I therefore plead with you to have this stopped. For God's sake, give us unity in this country and let us get on with the war.

Now, I do not favor stopping the O. W. I. I think it can do some effective foreign propaganda. I only favor cutting out the domestic propaganda, because we do not need it and it will do more harm than good. Mr. Davis is a capable man. If he can help win the war by propagandizing abroad, I am for it, but do not flood our American homes with



stuff that we do not want. Let him send all the propaganda he wants to the Arabs, Italians in Italy, and anybody else over there, if it will do good.

Now, as to his news here. What is wrong with the Army and Navy giving out their own statements? They have press sections and skilled newsmen in them. They know what the facts are. No one can say it will hurt the war effort to let them do it. They did it in the First World War, I am informed. Do we need to spend millions and millions of the taxpayers' money to have another agency duplicate the very work which the War and Navy Departments are prepared to do?

I stand ready to give the O. W. I. all the money it needs for its foreign activity, propaganda and all. I am ready to give them all the money domestically which they need for administrative and necessary purposes which will contribute to the war effort. But I do not think we ought to chuck millions and millions of the taxpayers' money into useless, and even in many cases hurtful, domestic propaganda. I am, therefore, supporting the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama, although I think it goes too far. Whatever is absolutely necessary for the domestic function, I want the O. W. I. to have. By voting for this amendment, we can place the matter where they can put in the bill such money as can be used wisely and profitably on the domestic front. The conferees can handle that. But a favorable vote on the amendment will let the O. W. I. know that we want to put a stop to useless, costly, and even hurtful, domestic propaganda.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is recognized.

Mr. TABER. I did not reserve any time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Chairman, I ask for recognition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Chairman, to a new Member it is rather disheartening to witness the spectacle that has taken place in this Chamber this afternoon. I want to tell you Members on the floor that for some time I have been chairman of the speakers' committee on civilian defense back home, in a Republican State, as a Democrat. As chairman of that committee I have gone over and distributed, on countless occasions, pamphlets which were prepared by the Office of War Information, and it would do the Members of this body an awful lot of good if they would only read them.

The next thing I want to say is, in my judgment as a Member, and as a new Member, that the Elmer Davis you are here maligning has the confidence and the respect of the American people. I also want to say that I believe the real purpose here is to snipe at the Commander in Chief in the conduct of the war effort on the domestic front.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MURPHY. In just a minute, please.

I would like to say that regardless of how you vote here today, to the American people I believe the conduct of the domestic part of Mr. Davis' war information program has been informative, instructive, inspirational, and absolutely essential to the successful conduct of the war effort.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] is recognized.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, it is difficult to believe that this amendment is offered seriously. It is to be hoped that the committee will not take it seriously.

It is difficult to believe its purport is fully appreciated. It wipes out absolutely collaboration with everything in the continental United States—newspapers, radio, and motion pictures—upon which we must depend to control and create sentiment in this war.

We have the cooperation, to an extraordinary extent, of the American press. We have gratifying cooperation from the motion-picture industry. I have here a telegram which has just been handed to me from Will Hays, president of the Motion Picture Distributors Association, indicating the warm cooperation of the motion-picture industry as follows:

JUNE 18, 1943.

HON. CLARENCE CANNON,  
Chairman, House Appropriations  
Committee, Washington, D. C.:

I note in report on hearings of your Committee on the War Agencies appropriation bill the inclusion of certain criticisms of the operations of the Office of War Information as they relate to the motion-picture industry. The effect of this is to suggest that Office of War Information has attempted to unduly influence the content of American motion pictures.

I speak from the best of information when I say that this view is not that of the industry. We have been greatly pleased by the understanding shown by the Bureau of Motion Pictures of the Office of War Information and by the complete lack of any effort on its part to dominate our operations. The industry on its own initiative offered to cooperate completely with the Government in the war effort, and the Bureau of Motion Pictures of the Office of War Information has aided our efforts to make our cooperation 100 percent effective. I know the motion-picture industry's feeling is one of genuine appreciation for the service being rendered to the industry.

WILL H. HAYS,  
President, Motion Picture Producers  
and Distributors Association.

Mr. Chairman, we are receiving just as generous and patriotic cooperation from other avenues of publicity. For example, it may be noted that we are receiving, through cooperation with O. W. I., \$142,711,000 worth of free radio service every year. I hope we can take a sober second thought on this amendment. It is difficult to imagine anything more serious in its effect upon the war effort.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The gentleman in his remarks earlier mentioned the fact of control of the press and moving pictures. The gentleman, I am sure, meant coordination of the information which they release.

Any Member of the House who knows anything about this knows that there is no effort of censorship in the Office of War Information; it is a coordinating agency; it undertakes to coordinate the releases from the different departments, but there is no effort, in spite of the hysteria which my remarks created, on the part of the Office of War Information to control the press. No one would vote for that, but what it undertakes to do is to coordinate war information, the releases by the war agencies, and it is not a censorship office as the gentleman referred to in his observation.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, of course the gentleman is correct. I said control when I should have said cooperation. The provision for censorship is carried in another item in the bill providing for the Office of Censorship under the direction of Director Byron Price. The Office of War Information is even more important because while censorship is largely self-enforcing, the dissemination of information vital to the war effort is an even more exacting and arduous activity. To quote Mr. Davis in his testimony before the committee, it is "an auxiliary to the armed forces whose effectiveness has been recognized by military commanders all the way down from Julius Caesar to General Marshall." The director submitted to the committee two personal letters from General Marshall strongly commending the Office of War Information and expressing appreciation of the invaluable service it has rendered.

Mr. Chairman, a vote to destroy that service is in effect a vote to handicap our armed forces by denial of a valuable and appreciated service.

The amendment should be rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

All time on the amendment has expired.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment, since it was modified, be again reported.

The Clerk again reported the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CANNON of Missouri) there were ayes 156 and noes 80. So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Smaller War Plants Corporation, administrative expenses: Not to exceed \$12,000,000 of the funds of the Smaller War Plants Corporation, acquired in accordance with the act of June 11, 1942 (Public Law 603), shall be available for the administrative expenses of said Corporation necessary to enable it to carry out the functions vested in it by such act, to carry out the provisions of section 2

of such act, and such other functions as may be lawfully delegated to it; including not to exceed \$1,000,000 for the temporary employment of persons or organizations by contract or otherwise without regard to the civil-service and classification laws for special services, including audits notwithstanding section 5 of the act of April 6, 1914 (5 U. S. C. 55); printing and binding; reimbursement, at not to exceed 3 cents per mile of employees for expenses incurred by them in performance of official travel in privately owned automobiles within the limits of their official stations; the hire of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles; and the objects specified in the general provisions applicable to the constituent agencies under the Office for Emergency Management: *Provided*, That, as determined by the board of directors, or such officer as may be designated by the board of directors for the purpose, expenditures (including expenditures for services performed on a force account or contract or fee basis) necessary in acquiring, operating, maintaining, improving, or disposing of real or personal property belonging to the Corporation or in which it has an interest (except property acquired for the administrative purposes of the Corporation), including expenses of collections of pledged collateral and expenses of service and administration of its loans, advances, and property under section 6 of said act, shall not be considered as administrative expenses for the purposes hereof: *Provided further*, That no part of said \$12,000,000 shall be obligated or expended unless and until an appropriate appropriation account shall have been established therefor pursuant to an appropriation warrant or a covering warrant, and all such expenses shall be accounted for and audited in accordance with the Budget and Accounting Act.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PATMAN: On page 28, line 6, after the word "exceed", strike out "\$12,000,000" and insert "\$18,000,000."

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, it is hoped that this amendment will meet with the approval of both sides. It has the unanimous approval of the Committee on Small Business of the House, which has had much to do with the Smaller War Plants Corporation.

The object of the Smaller War Plants Corporation is to permit the small man to go to an office near his home and receive a contract, credit, new facilities, rehabilitation of his plant, if necessary, all right there within a few miles of his home and in the same way and manner that the big man receives that same service here in Washington. The object is not to require the small man to have to come to Washington, someone who does not know his way around Washington, and will have to employ a lobbyist or a broker and pay him a big fee to get him entree to the various offices where he can have his case considered.

The object of the Smaller War Plants Corporation is to help small business, and the small manufacturers and producers of the country have been helped tremendously by the passage of this law.

Gen. Robert Wood Johnson is in charge of the administration of this section, and he will take this \$18,000,000 next year and with it do a good job, and, how insignificant is \$18,000,000 when compared with the good that that Corporation is doing every month and every week now.

The Budget arbitrarily reduced the amount to \$12,000,000. Let us give General Johnson the amount of money that we agree it will take, and at the same time, give him the responsibility. We have no experience to go on in the past, because they have been under the W. P. B. This is the first time it has had to work on its own, to work by itself. At the end of the year, after he has used the \$18,000,000, if he does use it, if he can account for it well, well and good. We can then make arrangements for the next year. But if he has not done so, a reduction can be made.

Mr. CHAIRMAN, let us not discriminate against small business by denying to them the comparatively small and insignificant amount compared with the billions of dollars and the contracts small business can get if we give them the services in the field, near their home, that the big businessmen now receive here in Washington where they have had paid lobbyists for just as long as we have had a government, and they know their way around.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. BURDICK. It is absolutely true, is it not, that this is the only agency in existence that the small businessman can appeal to?

Mr. PATMAN. Absolutely; it is the only one small business can appeal to, and certainly, Mr. Chairman, they are entitled to this comparatively small amount on the record they have already made.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. Are we to understand the amendment the gentleman is offering will bring a larger number of small business concerns into the war effort? If so, I will heartily support it.

Mr. PATMAN. It certainly will bring in a larger number of the comparatively small businesses into the war effort.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is offered at the request of the Committee on Small Business of the House, a unanimous request that it be offered, and the House is asked to adopt it.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 11 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, I am hoping that the committee will support this amendment. I find myself in a rather unique position. I do not think any Member of this House has seen me rise before to support an increase in an appropriation bill; I usually enjoyably support decreasing them.

I am not sure in my own mind that it is absolutely essential to have \$18,000,000. I am of the opinion that the Budget knows little or nothing about it and I am inclined to feel that the only course we can follow is that charted by the men in the Smaller War Plants Corporation who feel that this is the right amount of money necessary to do a good job. I think it is only right to confess that the Smaller War Plants Corporation under its first management, honest and conscientious as Lou Holland was, was a failure; that to date General Johnson has not accomplished any great deeds.

These things must be frankly admitted, but the way I view the matter, this is the last chance for the smaller manufacturers in this country to participate in the war effort, and if it fails now there is a great chance that the smaller manufacturers of the country will fail before the close of the war; so I am appealing to you, right or wrong the amount of the appropriation, to give the small manufacturers of this Nation this last chance.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLOESER. I yield.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Very commendably and accurately I am sure, the gentleman says, not being a member of the subcommittee, he does not have any very accurate idea of the financial needs of this outfit. May I say to the gentleman, however, that the Bureau of the Budget made a very careful inquiry into this and came to the conclusion that \$12,000,000 would be ample. The subcommittee unanimously agreed that \$12,000,000 would carry them, and that includes the members of the subcommittee on the gentleman's side. We went into it very carefully and very painstakingly.

Mr. PLOESER. I have also gone into the matter of the Bureau of the Budget's investigation of this matter, and I am frank in telling the gentleman that I do not believe that the Bureau of the Budget can confidently tell the Smaller War Plants Corporation what they adequately need. They did tell them to take this \$12,000,000 and come back in 3 or 4 months and get another \$12,000,000.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The gentleman has no confidence in his own subcommittee. He has repeatedly today thrown their judgment overboard and cut under them; now he cuts over them. I imagine the careful consideration of the subcommittee has not impressed the gentleman at all.

Mr. PLOESER. If I am to follow what the gentleman attempts to read into my mind, which does not exist, then I will assume that this House will follow its own design and increase it to \$18,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I am in sympathy with the work that should be being done by the head of the Smaller War Plants Corporation. I was not impressed with the gentleman who was at the head of it. I honestly feel that \$12,000,000 is about all that we ought to appropriate for this purpose; I believe



it is about as far as we ought to go. If they need more on a deficiency and are really doing the job I should not hesitate to give them more but I cannot do it now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, we all realize the tremendous difficulty small businesses and small industry have had in taking a part in this war effort. In the first place, small business cannot afford to have representatives in Washington to find out about specifications and bids and the various things they must do in order to get war orders; so it is very much better to have in the field somebody who can contact these small business organizations and bring them into the war effort.

In company with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] and other Members of the Small Business Committee, I have had an opportunity of examining the work that the Smaller War Plants Corporation is doing and I want to say to the Members of the House that General Johnson and his staff are working long hours. They work faithfully and late at night and they have gotten up a splendid plan and are having fine success doing those things necessary to help small industry and small business. They have a survey and have drawn up their plan, and their methods are showing good results. They are making headway and progress in bringing these small business organizations into the war effort. Anybody who says they do not have competent management, that General Johnson is not doing a good job, in my opinion just does not know what he is talking about. I believe we ought to give them a chance to do it. They have set up their budget. They cannot count on getting more money later. They must know now the amount they can count on. Give them a chance. I assure you every dollar spent by this agency will pay dividends.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

The gentleman from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the committee entertained the warmest sympathy for this activity and we have shown that sympathy in a very practical way. This agency was given \$7,500,000 last year. We have here increased that amount by something like 60 or 70 percent and instead of the \$7,500,000 which they received last year we this year recommended an appropriation of a little over \$12,000,000.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman must admit that at that time they were under the War Production Board and a lot of money came through the War Production Board, but it was not a success while under the War Production Board. This is the first time they have had an oppor-

tunity to be on their own and there is no experience to base it on.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. We gave them every benefit of the doubt. Instead of merely duplicating the funds given them last year we appropriated in excess of \$12,000,000 this year, and increased their personnel from 1,000 to 1,786.

In addition to that we have given them the sum of a million dollars which was not given last year, to provide for the hiring of engineers and the engagement of the services of engineering firms in connection with the survey of small plants. And in addition to that the sum of \$2,500,000 is provided in this \$12,000,000 for employing the R. F. C. to act as agent in closing the loans.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment differs from all other amendments offered during the afternoon in that it proposes to increase an appropriation. Heretofore the proposals have been to save money, to retrench, to curtail, to economize. Now for the first time we have a proposition to increase expenditures. In view of the fact that every item in the supply bills not directly connected with the immediate prosecution of the war is being drastically reduced this year, and the further fact that we are in this bill increasing the appropriation for this agency by something like 60 or 70 percent, I trust the committee will approach this proposal with caution and deliberation.

Mr. PATMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman is mistaken about that. The gentleman realizes, if the amount is not increased, many of these field offices will have to be closed and much of the field service that helps the real small businessman near his home will have to be curtailed and eliminated.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. No. Quite the contrary. We are increasing the appropriation, we are increasing the personnel. We are expanding operations. The Bureau of the Budget considered this, and the Subcommittee on Appropriations considered it. It was approved by the whole committee as it appears in the bill. In view of the consistent attitude of the committee this afternoon in favor of retrenchment, I am certain it will consider an increase to \$18,000,000 in this item as wholly unwarranted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. KEFAUVER), there were—ayes 52, noes 105.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

State marine schools: To reimburse the State of California, \$50,000; the State of Maine, \$50,000; the State of Massachusetts, \$50,000; the State of New York, \$50,000; and the State of Pennsylvania, \$50,000; for ex-

penses incurred in the maintenance and support of marine schools in such States as provided in the act authorizing the establishment of marine schools, and so forth, approved March 4, 1911, as amended (34 U. S. C., 1121-1123); and for the maintenance and repair of vessels loaned by the United States to the said States for use in connection with such State marine schools, \$100,000; in all, \$350,000.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, the request for W. S. A., the largest item in the pending bill, is divided into three subitems as follows: \$2,300,000,000 as compared with \$1,150,000,000 in the current year for the revolving fund; \$72,000,000 as compared with \$48,000,000 for maritime training; and \$350,000 as compared with \$360,000 for five State marine schools. The committee recommends all three items except for a reduction in the first to the extent of \$100,000,000, which Admiral Land and Mr. Douglas have indicated can be safely eliminated from the subitem providing for the purchase of ships.

The item for the revolving fund includes subitems for requisition, hire, and operation; for purchase of small ships; for reconditioning and conversion; for the operation of warehouses; for the operation of terminals; for degaussing and defending; for miscellaneous operating expenditure; for cash to liquidate obligations to the Army and Navy; and for general administrative expenditure.

The item for training is to take care of the 1944 quota of 35,000 officers and 145,000 seamen, estimated as necessary for the ships we are constructing.

Details have been furnished the committee in large measure off the record. Generally speaking, the request is based on the assumption that the number of ships and tonnage to be operated in 1944 will be approximately double that in 1943. I am in favor of the committee recommendations.

Despite the shortcomings of the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration in the past, the production of ships, so vital to the war effort, continues to pay eloquent tribute to the workers in our great ship-construction industry.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SPARKMAN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2868) making appropriations for the war agencies in the Executive Office of the President for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation

that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], page 10, line 6; also on the amendment having to do with limitation of personnel on page 13, also the businessman's proposition on page 13, the Sauthoff amendment on the roll-back, page 13, and the Starnes amendment on page 26.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the Andresen amendment having to do with grade labeling, on page 13.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when we come to the amendments on which a separate vote is asked, each one of them may be read immediately preceding the vote.

The SPEAKER. That will be done under the rule. The Clerk will report the first amendment on which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN: Page 10, line 6, strike out "\$165,000,000" and insert "\$130,000,000."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk called the roll; and there were—yeas 185, nays 147, not voting 99, as follows:

[Roll No. 102]

YEAS—185

|                |               |               |
|----------------|---------------|---------------|
| Allen, Ill.    | Dewey         | Hill          |
| Andersen,      | Dirksen       | Hoeven        |
| H. Carl        | Disney        | Holmes, Mass. |
| Andersen,      | Dondero       | Holmes, Wash. |
| August H.      | Dworshak      | Hope          |
| Andrews        | Elliot        | Horan         |
| Angell         | Elmer         | Howell        |
| Arends         | Elston, Ohio  | Hull          |
| Arnold         | Engel         | Jeffrey       |
| Auchincloss    | Fellows       | Jenkins       |
| Barrett        | Fenton        | Jennings      |
| Beall          | Gale          | Jensen        |
| Bender         | Gathings      | Johnson,      |
| Bennett, Mich. | Gavin         | Anton J.      |
| Bennett, Mo.   | Gearhart      | Johnson,      |
| Bishop         | Gerlach       | Calvin D.     |
| Blackney       | Gibson        | Johnson, Ind. |
| Bolton         | Gilchrist     | Johnson,      |
| Boren          | Gillette      | J. Leroy      |
| Brehm          | Goodwin       | Johnson, Ward |
| Brown, Ohio    | Gossett       | Jones         |
| Buffett        | Graham        | Jonkman       |
| Busbey         | Grant, Ala.   | Judd          |
| Canfield       | Grant, Ind.   | Keefe         |
| Carson, Ohio   | Griffiths     | Kilburn       |
| Carter         | Gross         | Kinzer        |
| Case           | Gwynne        | Kleberg       |
| Chenoweth      | Hagen         | Knutson       |
| Chipperfield   | Hale          | Kunkel        |
| Church         | Hall          | Lambertson    |
| Olson          | Leonard W.    | Landis        |
| Clevenger      | Halleck       | Lanham        |
| Cole, Mo.      | Hancock       | LeFevre       |
| Cole, N. Y.    | Harness, Ind. | Lemke         |
| Cravens        | Hartley       | Lewis, Ohio   |
| Cunningham     | Heldinger     | Luce          |
| Curtis         | Hertel        | McCowan       |
| Day            | Hess          | McGregor      |

|                |               |                |
|----------------|---------------|----------------|
| McKenzie       | Reece, Tenn.  | Starnes, Ala.  |
| McMillan       | Reed, Ill.    | Stefan         |
| McWilliams     | Reed, N. Y.   | Stevenson      |
| Maas           | Rees, Kans.   | Summer, Ill.   |
| Manasco        | Rivers        | Sundstrom      |
| Martin, Iowa   | Robison, Ky.  | Talbot         |
| Martin, Mass.  | Rockwell      | Talle          |
| Morrow         | Rodgers, Pa.  | Taylor         |
| Michener       | Rogers, Mass. | Thomas, N. J.  |
| Miller, Mo.    | Rohrbough     | Tibbott        |
| Miller, Nebr.  | Rolph         | Towe           |
| Miller, Pa.    | Rowe          | Troutman       |
| Monkiewicz     | Russell       | Vorys, Ohio    |
| Morrison, La.  | Sauthoff      | Vursell        |
| Mott           | Schiffler     | Wadsworth      |
| Mruk           | Schwabe       | Weichel, Ohio  |
| Murray, Wis.   | Scott         | West           |
| Newsome        | Shafer        | Wheat          |
| Norman         | Short         | Whitten        |
| O'Hara         | Sikes         | Wickersham     |
| Peterson, Fla. | Simpson, Ill. | Willey         |
| Pittenger      | Simpson, Pa.  | Wilson         |
| Ploeser        | Smith, Ohio   | Winstead       |
| Poage          | Smith, Wis.   | Winter         |
| Ramey          | Springer      | Wolfenden, Pa. |
| Rankin         | Stanley       |                |

NAYS—147

|              |                 |                  |
|--------------|-----------------|------------------|
| Abernethy    | Furlong         | O'Connor         |
| Allen, La.   | Gavagan         | O'Konski         |
| Anderson,    | Gordon          | O'Neal           |
| N. Mex.      | Core            | Outland          |
| Baldwin, Md. | Gorski          | Patman           |
| Bates, Ky.   | Granger         | Patton           |
| Bates, Mass. | Gregory         | Peterson, Ga.    |
| Beckworth    | Harris, Ark.    | Philbin          |
| Bell         | Harris, Va.     | Poulson          |
| Bland        | Hart            | Priest           |
| Bloom        | Hays            | Rabaut           |
| Bonner       | Hinshaw         | Ramspeck         |
| Boykin       | Hobbs           | Randolph         |
| Bradley, Pa. | Hoch            | Robertson        |
| Brooks       | Hollifield      | Robinson, Utah   |
| Brown, Ga.   | Johnson,        | Rogers, Calif.   |
| Bryson       | Luther A.       | Rowan            |
| Buckley      | Johnson,        | Sadowski         |
| Bulwinkle    | Lyndon B.       | Sasser           |
| Burdick      | Johnson, Okla.  | Scanlon          |
| Burgin       | Kee             | Schuetz          |
| Byrne        | Kefauver        | Slaughter        |
| Camp         | Kelley          | Smith, Maine     |
| Cannon, Mo.  | Kerr            | Smith, Va.       |
| Celler       | Kilday          | Snyder           |
| Cfark        | Kirwan          | Sparkman         |
| Coffee       | Lane            | Spence           |
| Colmer       | Lesinski        | Steagall         |
| Cooley       | Ludlow          | Stewart          |
| Cooper       | Lynch           | Sullivan         |
| Cox          | McCord          | Taber            |
| Creal        | McCormack       | Tarver           |
| Crosser      | McGranery       | Thomas, Tex.     |
| Cullen       | McMurray        | Thomason         |
| D'Alesandro  | Madden          | Voorhis, Calif.  |
| Davis        | Magnuson        | Walter           |
| Dawson       | Mahon           | Ward             |
| Delaney      | Mansfield,      | Wastelowski      |
| Dilweg       | Mont.           | Weaver           |
| Dingell      | Mansfield, Tex. | Wene             |
| Doughton     | Marcantonio     | Welchel, Ga.     |
| Durham       | Miller, Conn.   | White            |
| Ellison, Md. | Mills           | Whittington      |
| Feighan      | Monroney        | Wigglesworth     |
| Fernandez    | Morrison, N. C. | Wolverton, N. J. |
| Fitzpatrick  | Murdoch         | Woodrum, Va.     |
| Flannagan    | Murphy          | Worley           |
| Fogarty      | Norrell         | Wright           |
| Folger       | Norton          | Zimmerman        |
| Fulbright    | O'Brien, Ill.   |                  |
| Fulmer       | O'Brien, Mich.  |                  |

NOT VOTING—99

|                  |                  |                |
|------------------|------------------|----------------|
| Anderson, Calif. | Drewry           | Jackson        |
| Baldwin, N. Y.   | Eaton            | Jarman         |
| Bardeen          | Eberharter       | Kean           |
| Barry            | Ellis            | Kearney        |
| Bradley, Mich.   | Ellsworth        | Kennedy        |
| Burch, Va.       | Fay              | Keogh          |
| Burchill, N. Y.  | Fish             | King           |
| Butler           | Fisher           | Klein          |
| Cannon, Fla.     | Forand           | LaFollette     |
| Capozzoli        | Ford             | Larcade        |
| Carlson, Kans.   | Gallagher        | Lea            |
| Chapman          | Gamble           | LeCompte       |
| Cochran          | Gifford          | McGehee        |
| Compton          | Gillie           | McLean         |
| Costello         | Green            | Maloney        |
| Courtney         | Hall             | Mason          |
| Crawford         | Edwin Arthur May | Merritt        |
| Culkin           | Hare             | Mundt          |
| Curley           | Harless, Ariz.   | Murray, Tenn.  |
| Dickstein        | Hébert           | Myers          |
| Dies             | Heffernan        | Nichols        |
| Ditter           | Hendricks        | O'Brien, N. Y. |
| Domengeaux       | Hoffman          | O'Leary        |
| Douglas          | Izao             |                |

|          |                |                 |
|----------|----------------|-----------------|
| O'Toole  | Sabath         | Treadway        |
| Pace     | Satterfield    | Van Zandt       |
| Pfeiffer | Sheppard       | Vincent, Ky.    |
| Phillips | Sheridan       | Vinson, Ga.     |
| Plumley  | Smith, W. Va.  | Weiss           |
| Powers   | Somers, N. Y.  | Welch           |
| Pracht   | Stearns, N. H. | Wolcott         |
| Price    | Stockman       | Woodruff, Mich. |
| Richards | Sumners, Tex.  |                 |
| Rizley   | Tolan          |                 |

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Powers for, with Mr. Drewry against.  
 Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall for, with Mr. Burch of Virginia against.  
 Mr. Kean for, with Mr. Keogh against.  
 Mr. Pracht for, with Mr. Chapman against.  
 Mr. LaFollette for, with Mr. Pfeiffer against.  
 Mr. Carlson of Kansas for, with Mr. Satterfield against.  
 Mr. Treadway for, with Mr. Vinson of Georgia against.  
 Mr. Woodruff of Michigan for, with Mr. Kennedy against.  
 Mr. Gillie for, with Mr. Weiss against.  
 Mr. Gifford for, with Mr. Capozzoli against.  
 Mr. Rizley for, with Mr. Myers against.  
 Mr. Mundt for, with Mr. Eberharter against.  
 Mr. Anderson of California for, with Mr. Merritt against.  
 Mr. Douglas for, with Mr. Curley against.  
 Mr. Gallagher for, with Mr. Burchill of New York against.  
 Mr. McLean for, with Mr. Heffernan against.  
 Mr. Mason for, with Mr. Hare against.  
 Mr. Eaton for, with Mr. Klein against.  
 Mr. Wolcott for, with Mr. Tolan against.  
 Mr. O'Brien of New York for, with Mr. Somers of New York against.  
 Mr. Ellsworth for, with Mr. King against.  
 Mr. Gamble for, with Mr. Fay against.  
 Mr. Butler for, with Mr. Izac against.

General pairs:

Mr. McGehee with Mr. Ditter.  
 Mr. Pace with Mr. Plumley.  
 Mr. Barry with Mr. Fish.  
 Mr. Ford with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.  
 Mr. May with Mr. Welch.  
 Mr. Cannon of Florida with Mr. Baldwin of New York.  
 Mr. Hébert with Mr. Compton.  
 Mr. Maloney with Mr. Hoffman.  
 Mr. Richards with Mr. Van Zandt.  
 Mr. Green with Mr. Culkin.  
 Mr. Costello with Mr. Phillips.  
 Mr. O'Toole with Mr. Ellis.  
 Mr. Forand with Mr. Crawford.  
 Mr. Larcade with Mr. Stockman.  
 Mr. Jarman with Mr. LeCompte.  
 Mr. Domengeaux with Mr. Stearns of New Hampshire.  
 Mr. Price with Mr. Kearney.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN: On page 13, at the end of line 3, strike out the period and insert a colon and the following: "Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be directly or indirectly used for the payment of the salary or expenses of any person who engages in or directs the formulation of any price policy, maximum price, or price ceiling with respect to any article or commodity unless such person shall have had not less than 5 continuous years of actual business experience in the particular field of business, industry, or commerce to which the price policy, maximum price, or price ceiling in the formulation of which he is engaged or whose formulation he directs, shall apply; but this limitation shall not apply to any act of the Administrator or Acting Adminis-



trator as the case may be in considering, adopting, signing, and promulgating price policies, maximum prices, or price ceilings formulated and prepared in compliance herewith."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on this amendment I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 189, nays 144, not voting 98, as follows:

[Roll No. 103]

YEAS—189

|                      |               |                  |
|----------------------|---------------|------------------|
| Allen, Ill.          | Hagen         | Murray, Wis.     |
| Andersen, H. Carl    | Hale          | Newsome          |
| Andresen, Leonard W. | Hall          | Norman           |
| August H.            | Halleck       | Norrell          |
| Andrews              | Hancock       | O'Connor         |
| Angell               | Harness, Ind. | O'Hara           |
| Arndt                | Hartley       | O'Konski         |
| Arnold               | Heldinger     | Philbin          |
| Auchincloss          | Herter        | Pittenger        |
| Barrett              | Hess          | Ploeser          |
| Bates, Mass.         | Hill          | Poage            |
| Beall                | Hinschaw      | Poulson          |
| Bender               | Hoeven        | Ramey            |
| Bennett, Mich.       | Holmes, Mass. | Randolph         |
| Bennett, Mo.         | Holmes, Wash. | Reece, Tenn.     |
| Bishop               | Hope          | Reed, Ill.       |
| Blackney             | Horan         | Rees, Kans.      |
| Bolton               | Hull          | Robison, Ky.     |
| Bonner               | Jeffrey       | Rockwell         |
| Brehm                | Jenkins       | Rodgers, Pa.     |
| Brown, Ohio          | Jennings      | Rogers, Mass.    |
| Buffett              | Jensen        | Rohrbough        |
| Busbey               | Johnson       | Rowe             |
| Canfield             | Anton J.      | Sauthoff         |
| Carson, Ohio         | Johnson       | Schiffler        |
| Carter               | Calvin D.     | Schwabe          |
| Case                 | Johnson, Ind. | Scott            |
| Chenoweth            | Johnson       | Shafer           |
| Chiperfield          | J. Leroy      | Short            |
| Church               | Johnson, Ward | Simpson, Ill.    |
| Clason               | Jones         | Simpson, Pa.     |
| Clevenger            | Jonkman       | Smith, Maine     |
| Cole, Mo.            | Judd          | Smith, Ohio      |
| Cole, N. Y.          | Keefe         | Smith, Wis.      |
| Colmer               | Kilburn       | Springer         |
| Cox                  | Kinzer        | Stanley          |
| Cravens              | Kleberg       | Stefan           |
| Cunningham           | Knutson       | Stevenson        |
| Curtis               | Kunkel        | Stewart          |
| Day                  | Lambertson    | Sumner, Ill.     |
| Dewey                | Landis        | Sundstrom        |
| Dirksen              | Lanham        | Taber            |
| Dondero              | LeFevre       | Talbot           |
| Dworschak            | Lemke         | Talle            |
| Elliot               | Luce          | Taylor           |
| Elmer                | McCowan       | Thomas, N. J.    |
| Elston, Ohio         | McGregor      | Tibbott          |
| Engel                | McKenzie      | Towe             |
| Fellows              | McWilliams    | Troutman         |
| Fenton               | Maas          | Vorsy, Ohio      |
| Fisher               | Manasco       | Vursell          |
| Gale                 | Mansfield     | Wadsworth        |
| Gathings             | Mont.         | Wasielewski      |
| Gavin                | Martin, Iowa  | Weichel, Ohio    |
| Gearhart             | Martin, Mass. | West             |
| Gerlach              | Morrow        | Wheat            |
| Gilchrist            | Michener      | Wickersham       |
| Gillette             | Miller, Conn. | Wigglesworth     |
| Goodwin              | Miller, Mo.   | Willey           |
| Graham               | Miller, Nebr. | Wilson           |
| Grant, Ala.          | Miller, Pa.   | Winter           |
| Grant, Ind.          | Monkiewicz    | Wolfenden, Pa.   |
| Griffiths            | Morrison, La. | Wolverton, N. J. |
| Gross                | Mott          |                  |
| Gwynne               | Mruk          |                  |

NAYS—144

|                   |              |              |
|-------------------|--------------|--------------|
| Abernethy         | Burdick      | Dillweg      |
| Allen, La.        | Burgin       | Dingell      |
| Anderson, N. Mex. | Byrne        | Doughton     |
| Bates, Ky.        | Camp         | Durham       |
| Beckworth         | Cannon, Mo.  | Ellison, Md. |
| Bell              | Celler       | Feighan      |
| Eland             | Clark        | Fernandez    |
| Bloom             | Coffee       | Fitzpatrick  |
| Boren             | Cooley       | Flannagan    |
| Boykin            | Cooper       | Fogarty      |
| Bradley, Pa.      | Creal        | Folger       |
| Brooks            | Crosser      | Fulbright    |
| Brown, Ga.        | Cullen       | Fulmer       |
| Bryson            | D'Alessandro | Furlong      |
| Buckley           | Davis        | Gavagan      |
| Bulwinkle         | Dawson       | Gibson       |
|                   | Delaney      | Gordon       |

|                |                 |                 |
|----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Gore           | McMillan        | Sadowski        |
| Gorski         | McMurray        | Sasser          |
| Gossett        | Madden          | Scanlon         |
| Granger        | Magnuson        | Schuetz         |
| Gregory        | Mahon           | Sikes           |
| Harless, Ariz. | Mansfield, Tex. | Slaughter       |
| Harris, Ark.   | Marcantonio     | Smith, Va.      |
| Harris, Va.    | Mills           | Snyder          |
| Hart           | Monroney        | Sparkman        |
| Hays           | Morrison, N. C. | Spence          |
| Hobbs          | Murdock         | Starnes, Ala.   |
| Hoch           | Murphy          | Steagall        |
| Holifield      | Myers           | Sullivan        |
| Johnson        | Norton          | Summers, Tex.   |
| Luther A.      | O'Brien, Ill.   | Tarver          |
| Johnson        | O'Brien, Mich.  | Thomas, Tex.    |
| Lyndon B.      | O'Neal          | Thomason        |
| Johnson, Okla. | Outland         | Vincent, Ky.    |
| Kee            | Patman          | Voorhis, Calif. |
| Kefauver       | Patton          | Walter          |
| Kelley         | Peterson, Fla.  | Ward            |
| Kerr           | Peterson, Ga.   | Weaver          |
| Kilday         | Priest          | Wene            |
| Kirwan         | Rabaut          | Welch, Ga.      |
| Lane           | Ramspeck        | White           |
| Lea            | Rankin          | Whitten         |
| Lesinski       | Rivers          | Whittington     |
| Ludlow         | Robertson       | Winstead        |
| Lynch          | Robinson, Utah  | Woodrum, Va.    |
| McCord         | Rogers, Calif.  | Worley          |
| McCormack      | Rowan           | Wright          |
| McGranery      | Russell         | Zimmerman       |

NOT VOTING—98

|                  |              |                 |
|------------------|--------------|-----------------|
| Anderson, Calif. | Forand       | Merritt         |
| Baldwin, Md.     | Ford         | Mundt           |
| Baldwin, N. Y.   | Gallagher    | Murray, Tenn.   |
| Barden           | Gamble       | Nichols         |
| Barry            | Gifford      | O'Brien, N. Y.  |
| Bradley, Mich.   | Gillie       | O'Leary         |
| Burch, Va.       | Green        | O'Toole         |
| Burchill, N. Y.  | Hall         | Pace            |
| Butler           | Edwin Arthur | Pfeifer         |
| Cannon, Fla.     | Hare         | Phillips        |
| Capozzoli        | Hébert       | Plumley         |
| Carlson, Kans.   | Heffernan    | Powers          |
| Chapman          | Hendricks    | Pracht          |
| Cochran          | Hoffman      | Price           |
| Compton          | Howell       | Richards        |
| Costello         | Izac         | Rizley          |
| Courtney         | Jackson      | Rolph           |
| Crawford         | Jarman       | Sabath          |
| Culkin           | Kearney      | Satterfield     |
| Curley           | Kennedy      | Sheppard        |
| Dickstein        | Keogh        | Sheridan        |
| Dies             | King         | Smith, W. Va.   |
| Disney           | Klein        | Somers, N. Y.   |
| Ditter           | LaFollette   | Stearns, N. H.  |
| Domengeaux       | Larade       | Stockman        |
| Douglas          | LeCompte     | Tolan           |
| Drewry           | Lewis, Ohio  | Treadway        |
| Eaton            | McGee        | Van Zandt       |
| Eberhart         | McLean       | Vinson, Ga.     |
| Ellis            | Maloney      | Weiss           |
| Ellsworth        | Mason        | Welch           |
| Fay              | May          | Wolcott         |
| Fish             |              | Woodruff, Mich. |

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Powers for, with Mr. Drewry against.  
 Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall for, with Mr. Burch of Virginia against.  
 Mr. Kean for, with Mr. Keogh against.  
 Mr. Pracht for, with Mr. Chapman against.  
 Mr. LaFollette for, with Mr. Pfeifer against.  
 Mr. Carlson of Kansas for, with Mr. Satterfield against.  
 Mr. Treadway for, with Mr. Vinson of Georgia against.  
 Mr. Woodruff of Michigan for, with Mr. Kennedy against.  
 Mr. Gille for, with Mr. Weiss against.  
 Mr. Gifford for, with Mr. Capozzoli against.  
 Mr. Mundt for, with Mr. Eberhart against.  
 Mr. Douglas for, with Mr. Curley against.  
 Mr. Gallagher for, with Mr. Buchill of New York against.  
 Mr. McLean for, with Mr. Heffernan against.  
 Mr. Mason for, with Mr. Hare against.  
 Mr. Eaton for, with Mr. Klein against.  
 Mr. Wolcott for, with Mr. Tolan against.  
 Mr. O'Brien of New York for, with Mr. Somers of New York against.  
 Mr. Ellsworth for, with Mr. King against.  
 Mr. Gamble for, with Mr. Fay against.

Mr. Butler for, with Mr. Izac against.  
 Mr. Rizley for, with Mr. Merritt against.  
 Mr. Lewis of Ohio for, with Mr. Ford against.  
 Mr. Howell for, with Mr. Barry against.

General pairs:

Mr. McGehee with Mr. Ditter.  
 Mr. Pace with Mr. Plumley.  
 Mr. Cochran with Mr. Fish.  
 Mr. May with Mr. Welch.  
 Mr. Cannon of Florida with Mr. Baldwin of New York.  
 Mr. Hébert with Mr. Compton.  
 Mr. Maloney with Mr. Hoffman.  
 Mr. Richards with Mr. Van Zandt.  
 Mr. Green with Mr. Culkin.  
 Mr. Costello with Mr. Phillips.  
 Mr. O'Toole with Mr. Ellis.  
 Mr. Forand with Mr. Crawford.  
 Mr. Larcade with Mr. Stockman.  
 Mr. Jarman with Mr. LeCompte.  
 Mr. Domengeaux with Mr. Stearns of New Hampshire.  
 Mr. Price with Mr. Kearney.  
 Mr. Smith of West Virginia with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.  
 Mr. Courtney with Mr. Rolph.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I desire to vote "aye" on the amendment.

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman in the hall listening when his name should have been called?

Mr. HOWELL. No, I was just outside.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not qualify.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk proceeded to report the Sauthoff amendment.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Are not the amendments to be taken up in the order in which they were adopted?

The SPEAKER. The Chair would hold that they are to be adopted in the order in which they appear in the bill.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Then in that case I think the Andresen amendment precedes this amendment, though I may be mistaken. They are both on the same page and same line.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Andresen amendment.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RABAUT. The Dirksen amendment prohibiting subsidies preceded both of these amendments.

The SPEAKER. A separate vote was not demanded on that amendment.

Mr. RABAUT. I thought they referred to the amendment on page 13 at the end of line 3, the first amendment.

The SPEAKER. Several amendments were adopted on that page of the bill. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] did not ask for a separate vote on that.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. We did not ask for a separate vote on that, Mr. Speaker. It was agreed to with the others.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Andresen amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN: At the end of the paragraph on page 13 insert the following language: "Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the promulgation or enforcement of orders requiring grade labeling or standardization of food products, wearing apparel or other processed or manufactured commodities or articles."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. Those in favor of ordering the yeas and nays will rise and stand until counted. [After counting.] Forty-three Members have risen, not a sufficient number, and the yeas and nays are refused. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MARCANTONIO) there were—ayes 140, noes 85.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SAUTHOFF: On page 13, line 3, after the word "Office", change the period to a colon and add the following: "Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for roll-backs on any food commodity which has not yet reached parity, nor on any commodity which is not a necessity."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 229, nays 105, not voting 97, as follows:

[Roll No. 104]

YEAS—229

|                |              |                |
|----------------|--------------|----------------|
| Abernethy      | Clason       | Gross          |
| Allen, Ill.    | Clevenger    | Gwynne         |
| Andersen,      | Cole, Mo.    | Hagen          |
| H. Carl        | Cole, N. Y.  | Hale           |
| Andresen,      | Colmer       | Hall           |
| August H.      | Cunningham   | Leonard W.     |
| Andrews        | Curtis       | Halleck        |
| Angell         | Day          | Hancock        |
| Arends         | Dewey        | Harness, Ind.  |
| Arnold         | Dilweg       | Harris, Ark.   |
| Auchincloss    | Dirksen      | Harris, Va.    |
| Barrett        | Disney       | Hartley        |
| Bates, Mass.   | Dondero      | Heldinger      |
| Beall          | Dworshak     | Herter         |
| Beckworth      | Elliot       | Hess           |
| Bell           | Elmer        | Hill           |
| Bender         | Elston, Ohio | Hinshaw        |
| Bennett, Mich. | Engel        | Hoeben         |
| Bennett, Mo.   | Fellows      | Holmes, Mass.  |
| Bishop         | Fenton       | Holmes, Wash.  |
| Blackney       | Fisher       | Hope           |
| Bolton         | Fulbright    | Horan          |
| Bonner         | Fulmer       | Howell         |
| Boren          | Gale         | Hull           |
| Boykin         | Gathings     | Jeffrey        |
| Brehm          | Gavin        | Jenkins        |
| Brown, Ga.     | Gearhart     | Jennings       |
| Brown, Ohio    | Gerlach      | Jensen         |
| Bryson         | Gibson       | Johnson        |
| Buffett        | Gilchrist    | Anton J.       |
| Burdick        | Gillette     | Johnson        |
| Busbey         | Goodwin      | Calvin D.      |
| Camp           | Gore         | Johnson, Ind.  |
| Carson, Ohio   | Gossett      | Johnson        |
| Carter         | Graham       | J. Leroy       |
| Case           | Granger      | Johnson        |
| Chenoweth      | Grant, Ala.  | Luther A.      |
| Chipherfield   | Grant, Ind.  | Johnson, Okla. |
| Church         | Griffiths    | Johnson, Ward  |

|                 |                |                  |
|-----------------|----------------|------------------|
| Jones           | Mruk           | Smith, Ohio      |
| Jonkman         | Murdock        | Smith, Va.       |
| Judd            | Murray, Wis.   | Smith, Wis.      |
| Keefe           | Newsome        | Springer         |
| Kilburn         | Norman         | Stanley          |
| Klinzer         | O'Connor       | Starnes, Ala.    |
| Kleberg         | O'Hara         | Seagall          |
| Knutson         | O'Konski       | Stefan           |
| Kunkel          | Peterson, Fla. | Stevenson        |
| Lambertson      | Peterson, Ga.  | Stewart          |
| Landis          | Philbin        | Sullivan         |
| Lanham          | Pittenger      | Sumner, Ill.     |
| Lea             | Ploeser        | Sundstrom        |
| LeFevre         | Poage          | Taber            |
| Lemke           | Poulson        | Talbot           |
| Lewis, Ohio     | Ramey          | Talle            |
| Luce            | Rankin         | Tarver           |
| McCord          | Reece, Tenn.   | Taylor           |
| McCowan         | Reed, Ill.     | Thomas, N. J.    |
| McGregor        | Reed, N. Y.    | Thomason         |
| McKenzie        | Rees, Kans.    | Tibbott          |
| McMillan        | Rivers         | Towe             |
| McWilliams      | Robertson      | Troutman         |
| Maas            | Robison, Ky.   | Voorhis, Calif.  |
| Mahon           | Rockwell       | Vorys, Ohio      |
| Manasco         | Rodgers, Pa.   | Vursell          |
| Mansfield,      | Rogers, Mass.  | Wadsworth        |
| Mont.           | Rohrbough      | Weichel, Ohio    |
| Mansfield, Tex. | Rolph          | West             |
| Martin, Iowa    | Rowe           | Whelchel, Ga.    |
| Martin, Mass.   | Russell        | Whitten          |
| Marrow          | Sauthoff       | Wickersham       |
| Michener        | Schiffler      | Wigglesworth     |
| Miller, Conn.   | Schwabe        | Willey           |
| Miller, Mo.     | Shafer         | Wilson           |
| Miller, Nebr.   | Short          | Winstead         |
| Miller, Pa.     | Sikes          | Winter           |
| Monkiewicz      | Simpson, Ill.  | Wolfenden, Pa.   |
| Morrison, La.   | Simpson, Pa.   | Wolverton, N. J. |
| Mott            | Smith, Maine   | Worley           |

NAYS—105

|              |                 |                 |
|--------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Allen, La.   | Folger          | Norrell         |
| Anderson,    | Furlong         | Norton          |
| N. Mex.      | Gavagan         | O'Brien, Ill.   |
| Baldwin, Md. | Gordon          | O'Brien, Mich.  |
| Bates, Ky.   | Gorski          | O'Neal          |
| Bland        | Gregory         | Outland         |
| Bloom        | Harless, Ariz.  | Patman          |
| Bradley, Pa. | Hart            | Patton          |
| Brooks       | Hays            | Priest          |
| Buckley      | Hobbs           | Rabaut          |
| Bulwinkle    | Hoch            | Ramspeck        |
| Burgin       | Hollfield       | Randolph        |
| Byrne        | Jackson         | Robinson, Utah. |
| Canfield     | Johnson,        | Rogers, Calif.  |
| Celler       | Lyndon, B.      | Rowan           |
| Clark        | Kee             | Sadowski        |
| Coffee       | Kefauver        | Sascer          |
| Cooley       | Kelley          | Seanton         |
| Cooper       | Kerr            | Schuetz         |
| Cravens      | Kilday          | Scott           |
| Creal        | Kirwan          | Snyder          |
| Crosser      | Lane            | Sparkman        |
| Cullen       | Lesinski        | Spence          |
| D'Alessandro | Ludlow          | Thomas, Tex.    |
| Davis        | Lynch           | Vincent, Ky.    |
| Dawson       | McCormack       | Walter          |
| Delaney      | McGranery       | Ward            |
| Dingell      | McMurray        | Wasielewski     |
| Doughton     | Madden          | Weaver          |
| Durham       | Magnuson        | Wene            |
| Ellison, Md. | Marcantonio     | White           |
| Feighan      | Mills           | Whittington     |
| Fernandez    | Monroney        | Woodrum, Va.    |
| Fitzpatrick  | Morrison, N. O. | Wright          |
| Flannagan    | Murphy          | Zimmerman       |
| Fogarty      | Myers           |                 |

NOT VOTING—97

|                  |              |                |
|------------------|--------------|----------------|
| Anderson, Calif. | Douglas      | Kearney        |
| Baldwin, N. Y.   | Drewry       | Kennedy        |
| Barden           | Eaton        | Keogh          |
| Barry            | Eberharter   | Kling          |
| Bradley, Mich.   | Ellis        | Klein          |
| Burch, Va.       | Ellsworth    | LaFollette     |
| Burchill, N. Y.  | Fay          | Larcade        |
| Butler           | Fish         | LeCompte       |
| Cannon, Fla.     | Forand       | McGehee        |
| Cannon, Mo.      | Ford         | McLean         |
| Capozzoli        | Gallagher    | Maloney        |
| Carlson, Kans.   | Gamble       | Mason          |
| Chapman          | Gifford      | May            |
| Cochran          | Gillie       | Merritt        |
| Compton          | Green        | Mundt          |
| Costello         | Hall         | Murray, Tenn.  |
| Courtney         | Edwin Arthur | Nichols        |
| Cox              | Hare         | O'Brien, N. Y. |
| Crawford         | Hébert       | O'Leary        |
| Culkin           | Heffernan    | O'Toole        |
| Curley           | Hendricks    | Pace           |
| Dickstein        | Hoffman      | Pfeifer        |
| Dies             | Izac         | Phillips       |
| Ditter           | Jarman       | Plumley        |
| Domengeaux       | Kean         | Powers         |

|             |                |                 |
|-------------|----------------|-----------------|
| Pracht      | Slaughter      | Van Zandt       |
| Price       | Smith, V. Va.  | Vinson, Ga.     |
| Richards    | Somers, N. Y.  | Weiss           |
| Rizley      | Stearns, N. H. | Welch           |
| Sabath      | Stockman       | Wheat           |
| Satterfield | Summers, Tex.  | Wolcott         |
| Sheppard    | Tolan          | Woodruff, Mich. |
| Sheridan    | Treadway       |                 |

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Powers for, with Mr. Drewry against.  
Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall for, with Mr. Burch of Virginia against.

Mr. Kean for, with Mr. Keogh against.  
Mr. Pracht for, with Mr. Chapman against.  
Mr. LaFollette for, with Mr. Pfeifer against.  
Mr. Carlson of Kansas for, with Mr. Satterfield against.

Mr. Treadway for, with Mr. Courtney against.

Mr. Woodruff of Michigan for, with Mr. Kennedy against.

Mr. Gillie for, with Mr. Weiss against.  
Mr. Gifford for, with Mr. Capozzoli against.  
Mr. Mundt for, with Mr. Eberharter against.  
Mr. Douglas for, with Mr. Curley against.  
Mr. Gallagher for, with Mr. Burchill of New York against.

Mr. McLean for, with Mr. Heffernan against.

Mr. Mason for, with Mr. Hare against.  
Mr. Eaton for, with Mr. Klein against.

Mr. Wolcott for, with Mr. Tolan against.  
Mr. O'Brien of New York for, with Mr. Somers of New York against.

Mr. Ellsworth for, with Mr. King against.  
Mr. Gamble for, with Mr. Fay against.

Mr. Butler for, with Mr. Izac against.  
Mr. Rizley for, with Mr. Merritt against.  
Mr. Anderson of California for, with Mr. Ford against.

Mr. Wheat for, with Mr. Barry against.

General pairs:

Mr. McGehee with Mr. Ditter.  
Mr. Pace with Mr. Plumley.

Mr. Cochran with Mr. Fish.  
Mr. May with Mr. Welch.

Mr. Slaughter with Mr. Baldwin of New York.

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Compton.  
Mr. Maloney with Mr. Hoffman.

Mr. Richards with Mr. Van Zandt.  
Mr. Green with Mr. Culklin.

Mr. Costello with Mr. Phillips.  
Mr. O'Toole with Mr. Ellis.

Mr. Forand with Mr. Crawford.  
Mr. Larcade with Mr. Stockman.

Mr. Jarman with Mr. LeCompte.  
Mr. Domengeaux with Mr. Stearns of New Hampshire.

Mr. Vinson of Georgia with Mr. Kearney.  
Mr. Smith of West Virginia with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.

Mr. CAMP changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

Mr. BECKWORTH changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STARNES of Alabama: On page 26, line 2, strike out "\$34,472,504" and insert "\$28,972,504"; and in line 6, after the word "Branch" strike out the following: "and not more than \$5,500,000 shall be allocated to the Domestic Operations Branch" and insert the words "and no funds shall be allocated to the Domestic Operations Branch."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.



Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 218, nays 114, not voting 99, as follows:

[Roll No. 105]

#### YEAS—218

|                |                 |                  |
|----------------|-----------------|------------------|
| Abernethy      | Hagen           | Norrell          |
| Allen, Ill.    | Hale            | O'Hara           |
| Allen, La.     | Hall            | O'Konski         |
| Andersen,      | Leonard W.      | Peterson, Fla.   |
| H. Carl        | Halleck         | Peterson, Ga.    |
| Andresen,      | Hancock         | Philbin          |
| August H.      | Earness, Ind.   | Pittenger        |
| Angell         | Harris, Ark.    | Ploesser         |
| Arends         | Harris, Va.     | Poege            |
| Arnold         | Hartley         | Poulson          |
| Auchincloss    | Heldinger       | Ramey            |
| Barrett        | Hess            | Rankin           |
| Bates, Mass.   | Hill            | Reece, Tenn.     |
| Beall          | Hinschaw        | Reed, Ill.       |
| Beckworth      | Hobbs           | Reed, N. Y.      |
| Bender         | Hoeven          | Rees, Kans.      |
| Bennett, Mich. | Holmes, Mass.   | Rivers           |
| Bishop         | Holmes, Wash.   | Robertson        |
| Blackney       | Hope            | Robison, Ky.     |
| Bolton         | Horan           | Rockwell         |
| Bonner         | Howell          | Rodgers, Pa.     |
| Boykin         | Hull            | Rogers, Mass.    |
| Brehm          | Jeffrey         | Rohrbough        |
| Brooks         | Jenkins         | Rolph            |
| Brown, Ga.     | Jennings        | Rowe             |
| Brown, Ohio    | Jensen          | Russell          |
| Bryson         | Johnson         | Sauthoff         |
| Buffett        | Anton J.        | Schiffler        |
| Busbey         | Johnson         | Schwabe          |
| Camp           | Calvin D.       | Scott            |
| Carnfield      | Johnson, Ind.   | Shafer           |
| Carson, Ohio   | Johnson         | Short            |
| Carter         | J. Leroy        | Sikes            |
| Case           | Johnson, Ward   | Simpson, Ill.    |
| Chenoweth      | Jones           | Simpson, Pa.     |
| Chipherfield   | Jonkman         | Smith, Maine     |
| Church         | Judd            | Smith, Ohio      |
| Clason         | Keefe           | Smith, Va.       |
| Clevenger      | Kilburn         | Smith, Wis.      |
| Cole, Mo.      | Kinzer          | Sparkman         |
| Cole, N. Y.    | Kleberg         | Springer         |
| Colmer         | Knutson         | Stanley          |
| Cravens        | Kunkel          | Starnes, Ala.    |
| Cunningham     | Lambertson      | Steagall         |
| Curtis         | Landis          | Stefan           |
| Day            | Lanham          | Stevenson        |
| Dewey          | LeFevre         | Stewart          |
| Dirksen        | Lemke           | Sumner, Ill.     |
| D ndero        | Lesinski        | Sundstrom        |
| Dworshak       | Lewis, Ohio     | Talbot           |
| Elliott        | Luce            | Talle            |
| Elmer          | McCowan         | Taylor           |
| Elston, Ohio   | McGregor        | Thomas, N. J.    |
| Engel          | McKenzie        | Tibbott          |
| Fellows        | McMillan        | Towe             |
| Fenton         | McWilliams      | Troutman         |
| Fisher         | Maas            | Vorys, Ohio      |
| Fulmer         | Manasco         | Vursell          |
| Gale           | Mansfield, Tex. | Wadsworth        |
| Gathings       | Martin, Iowa    | Weichel, Ohio    |
| Gavin          | Martin, Mass.   | West             |
| Gearhart       | Marrow          | Wheat            |
| Gerlach        | Michener        | Whelchel, Ga.    |
| Gibson         | Miller, Conn.   | White            |
| Gilchrist      | Miller, Mo.     | Whitten          |
| Gillette       | Miller, Nebr.   | Whittington      |
| Goodwin        | Miller, Pa.     | Wickersham       |
| Gossett        | Mills           | Willey           |
| Graham         | Monkiewicz      | Willson          |
| Grant, Ala.    | Morrison, La.   | Winstead         |
| Grant, Ind.    | Mott            | Winter           |
| Gregory        | Murray, Wis.    | Wolfenden, Pa.   |
| Griffiths      | Newsome         | Wolverton, N. J. |
| Gross          | Norman          | Worley           |
| Gwynne         |                 |                  |

#### NAYS—114

|              |              |                |
|--------------|--------------|----------------|
| Anderson,    | Coffee       | Fernandez      |
| N. Mex.      | Cooley       | Fitzpatrick    |
| Baldwin, Md. | Cooper       | Flannagan      |
| Bates, Ky.   | Creal        | Fogarty        |
| Bland        | Crosser      | Folger         |
| Bloom        | Cullen       | Fulbright      |
| Boren        | D'Alesandro  | Furlong        |
| Bradley, Pa. | Davis        | Gavagan        |
| Buckley      | Dawson       | Gordon         |
| Bulwinkle    | Delaney      | Gore           |
| Burdick      | Dillweg      | Gorski         |
| Burgin       | Dingell      | Granger        |
| Byrne        | Doughton     | Harless, Ariz. |
| Cannon, Mo.  | Durham       | Hart           |
| Celler       | Ellison, Md. | Hays           |
| Clark        | Feighan      | Herter         |

|                |                 |                 |
|----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Hoch           | Mansfield,      | Sasscer         |
| Hollifield     | Mont.           | Scanlon         |
| Jackson        | Marcantonio     | Schuetz         |
| Johnson,       | Monroney        | Slaughter       |
| Luther A.      | Morrison, N. C. | Snyder          |
| Johnson,       | Murdock         | Spence          |
| Lyndon B.      | Murphy          | Sullivan        |
| Johnson, Okla. | Myers           | Taber           |
| Kee            | Norton          | Tarver          |
| Kefauver       | O'Brien, Ill.   | Thomas, Tex.    |
| Kelley         | O'Brien, Mich.  | Thomason        |
| Kerr           | O'Connor        | Vincent, Ky.    |
| Kilday         | O'Neal          | Voorhis, Calif. |
| Kirwan         | Outland         | Walter          |
| Lane           | Patman          | Ward            |
| Ludlow         | Patton          | Wasielewski     |
| Lynch          | Priest          | Weaver          |
| McCord         | Rabaut          | Wene            |
| McCormack      | Ramspeck        | Wigglesworth    |
| McGranery      | Randolph        | Woodrum, Va.    |
| McMurray       | Robinson, Utah  | Wright          |
| Madden         | Rogers, Calif.  | Zimmerman       |
| Magnuson       | Rowan           |                 |
| Mahon          | Sadowski        |                 |

#### NOT VOTING—99

|                  |              |                 |
|------------------|--------------|-----------------|
| Anderson, Calif. | Fay          | Mundt           |
| Andrews          | Fish         | Murray, Tenn.   |
| Baldwin, N. Y.   | Forand       | Nichols         |
| Barden           | Ford         | O'Brien, N. Y.  |
| Barry            | Gallagher    | O'Leary         |
| Bell             | Gamble       | O'Toole         |
| Bennett, Mo.     | Gifford      | Pace            |
| Bradley, Mich.   | Gillie       | Pfeifer         |
| Burch, Va.       | Green        | Phillips        |
| Burchill, N. Y.  | Hall         | Plumley         |
| Butler           | Edwin Arthur | Powers          |
| Cannon, Fla.     | Hare         | Pracht          |
| Capozzoli        | Hebert       | Price           |
| Carlson, Kans.   | Heffernan    | Richards        |
| Chapman          | Hendricks    | Rizley          |
| Cochran          | Hoffman      | Sabath          |
| Compton          | Izac         | Satterfield     |
| Costello         | Jarman       | Sheppard        |
| Courtney         | Kean         | Sheridan        |
| Cox              | Kearney      | Smith, W. Va.   |
| Cr wford         | Kennedy      | Somers, N. Y.   |
| Culkin           | Keogh        | Stearns, N. H.  |
| Curley           | King         | Starkman        |
| Dickstein        | Klein        | Summers, Tex.   |
| Dies             | LaFollette   | Tolan           |
| Disney           | Larcade      | Treadway        |
| Ditter           | Lea          | Van Zandt       |
| Domengeaux       | LeCompte     | Vinson, Ga.     |
| Douglas          | McGehee      | Weiss           |
| Drewry           | McLean       | Welch           |
| Eaton            | Maloney      | Wolcott         |
| Eberharter       | Mason        | Woodruff, Mich. |
| Ellis            | May          |                 |
| Ellsworth        | Merritt      |                 |

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Powers for, with Mr. Drewry against.  
 Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall for, with Mr. Burch of Virginia against.  
 Mr. Kean for, with Mr. Keogh against.  
 Mr. Pracht for, with Mr. Chapman against.  
 Mr. LaFollette for, with Mr. Pfeifer against.  
 Mr. Carlson of Kansas for, with Mr. Satterfield against.  
 Mr. Treadway for, with Mr. Courtney against.  
 Mr. Woodruff of Michigan for, with Mr. Kennedy against.  
 Mr. Gillie for, with Mr. Weiss against.  
 Mr. Gifford for, with Mr. Capozzoli against.  
 Mr. Mundt for, with Mr. Eberharter against.  
 Mr. Douglas for, with Mr. Curley against.  
 Mr. Gallagher for, with Mr. Burchill of New York against.  
 Mr. McLean for, with Mr. Heffernan against.  
 Mr. Mason for, with Mr. Hare against.  
 Mr. Eaton for, with Mr. Klein against.  
 Mr. Wolcott for, with Mr. Tolman against.  
 Mr. O'Brien of New York for, with Mr. Somers of New York against.  
 Mr. Ellsworth for, with Mr. King against.  
 Mr. Gamble for, with Mr. Fay against.  
 Mr. Butler for, with Mr. Izac against.  
 Mr. Rizley for, with Mr. Merritt against.  
 Mr. Anderson of California for, with Mr. Ford against.  
 Mr. Bennett of Missouri for, with Mr. Barry against.

#### General pairs:

Mr. McGehee with Mr. Ditter.  
 Mr. Pace with Mr. Plumley.  
 Mr. Cochran with Mr. Fish.  
 Mr. May with Mr. Welch.  
 Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Baldwin of New York.  
 Mr. Hébert with Mr. Compton.  
 Mr. Maloney with Mr. Hoffman.  
 Mr. Richards with Mr. Van Zandt.  
 Mr. Green with Mr. Culkin.  
 Mr. Costello with Mr. Phillips.  
 Mr. O'Toole with Mr. Ellis.  
 Mr. Forand with Mr. Crawford.  
 Mr. Larcade with Mr. Stockman.  
 Mr. Jarman with Mr. LeCompte.  
 Mr. Domengeaux with Mr. Stearns of New Hampshire.  
 Mr. Vinson of Georgia with Mr. Kearney.  
 Mr. Smith of West Virginia with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.  
 Mr. Bell with Mr. Andrews.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, when separate votes were requested on amendments, I asked for a separate vote on five amendments: On the Dirksen amendment for \$35,000,000; on the Dirksen amendment regarding limitation of personnel; on the Dirksen amendment for businessmen; on the Sauthoff roll-back amendment; and on the Starnes O. W. I. amendment. Subsequently, a vote was taken on the remainder of the amendments en gross. Later the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] rose to a parliamentary inquiry and asked if the Dirksen amendment, page 13, line 3, limitation of personnel, had been voted on. The fact that two amendments were agreed to on page 13, line 3, confused me, and I informed the Speaker a separate vote on it had not been requested when, as a matter of fact, it had been requested. It was my error. That amendment, then, Mr. Speaker, the Dirksen amendment on page 13, line 3, on limitation of personnel, the subsidy amendment, has not yet been voted on either en gross or separately, and it is now in order to vote upon it.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to read what the RECORD shows. After other matters:

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.  
 Mr. RABAUT. The Dirksen amendment prohibiting subsidies preceded both of these amendments.

The SPEAKER. A separate vote was not demanded on that amendment.

Mr. RABAUT. I thought they referred to the amendment on page 13 at the end of line 3, the first amendment.

The SPEAKER. Several amendments were adopted on that page of the bill. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] did not ask for a separate vote on that.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. We did not ask for a separate vote on that, Mr. Speaker. It was agreed to with the others.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes, Mr. Speaker; but I was in error in that statement as I have explained, because, as a matter of fact, it was requested. If the Speaker will call for the reporter's notes in which I requested separate votes on amendments he will see that I did request a separate vote on this amendment.

Therefore, it has not been voted on. It has not been voted on in gross; it has not been voted on separately; and it is now in order to vote on it separately, in accordance with the request.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, may I be heard?

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. O'NEAL. I should like to state that I examined the notes of the reporter which disclosed that the Chairman did ask for a separate vote on the Dirksen amendment on page 13, line 3, the personnel amendment.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is correct, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. I do not particularly care what the notes state; I think that this is the heart and soul of the bill before us and the membership of the House, particularly on the other side of the aisle, ought to have the intestinal fortitude—

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, the regular order.

Mr. DINGELL. Just a minute; I am recognized; I do not yield.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan has been recognized.

Mr. DINGELL. You ought to have the courage to vote on it.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. There were a number who desired a separate vote on that particular amendment and the only reason it was not requested was because we all understood the gentleman from Missouri had made that request.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Earlier in the afternoon I went to the Clerk's desk and made a note on all amendments which had been adopted to make sure that this amendment would be included for a separate vote. I was here while the gentleman from Missouri was asking for separate votes and he did ask for a separate vote on that particular amendment.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. This afternoon, when the votes were being taken in the Committee of the Whole—

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order. Unless unanimous consent is granted the gentleman cannot proceed.

Mr. RABAUT. The Chair has recognized me.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. This afternoon, when the votes were being taken in the Committee of the Whole, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] made the announcement in the Committee of the Whole that he would not ask for a teller

vote on this amendment as he would ask for a roll call, the yeas and nays, on it tonight.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, may I be heard?

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It is not a question of personal opinion or what we should like to do; it is a question of what the facts are. The time has now passed for demanding separate votes, and the Speaker has already ruled as the Record shows that this amendment has been voted on with other amendments.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the Dirksen amendment on limitation of personnel, on page 13, line 3, has not yet been voted upon; it has not been adopted. We did not vote upon it in gross and we have not voted upon it separately. Under the parliamentary situation at the present time the Dirksen amendment has not been adopted. Unless a vote is taken on it now it will not be a part of the bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The Record will show what the facts are.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MICHENER. If the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] did demand a separate vote on the amendment in question, then a reference to the reporter's notes will show the facts. Even if the Journal does show that the amendment had been voted on, if, as a matter of fact, the opinion of the Journal Clerk is incorrect, the reporter's statement as to what the request was should control. The Journal is not conclusive until it has been approved by the House.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully request a reading of the reporter's notes on my request for a separate vote.

The SPEAKER. The Chair did not hear the remark of the gentleman.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully request a reading of the reporter's notes on my request for a separate vote.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may have that privilege, but the Chair, regardless of his personal feelings about this, must state that the Journal shows that the amendment was adopted in gross with other amendments.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the reading of the reporter's notes reporting my request for a separate vote.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the rule having been promulgated by the Chair, should we not proceed with the regular order?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. This amendment has not been voted upon.

The SPEAKER. The Chair states that the Journal shows that it has been adopted.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Was my request for a reading of my request for a separate vote refused?

The SPEAKER. No. We do not have that part of the Record here.

The Chair holds that the amendment has been agreed to.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. RABAUT. On this, Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### REPORT OF THE NATIONAL PATENT PLANNING COMMISSION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 239)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Patents and ordered to be printed:

#### To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the report of the National Patent Planning Commission.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 18, 1943.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein a short statement by Mr. Cheney.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein an excerpt.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on the bill, H. R. 2943, and include therein a resolution adopted by the Federal Fire Council and a sample of their records and schedules under this bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record about forest-fire protection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein a news release from the Department of the Interior.



The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter on the McKellar bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from the Gardner Advertising Co.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all who have spoken on the bill just passed have 5 legislative days in which to extend their own remarks in the RECORD on the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SUNDBLOM] be permitted to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein two editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a part of an O. W. I. release.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a telegram I have received from a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an excerpt.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

(Mr. HOPE asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD).

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include certain amendments and editorials, referred to in my remarks this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter, referred to in my remarks made in the committee, and to extend my remarks in the Appendix.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a certain letter in connection with my remarks this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the death of our late colleague, Mr. Ball, of Connecticut, and I ask unanimous consent that those remarks may follow the announcement of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. McWILLIAMS] this morning.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONKIEWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request, and that my remarks may follow the remarks of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ELMER] I ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to revise and extend his remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow after the regular business and any other special orders I be permitted to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. DITTER, for 3 days, on account of death in family.

To Mr. STOCKMAN, for this afternoon, on account of official business.

To Mr. HARE, for 2 days, on account of important business.

To Mr. WHEAT, Mr. HEBERT, and Mr. BATES of Massachusetts (on request of Mr. RIVERS), and to Mr. RIVERS, for 2 weeks, on account of official business conducting an oil investigation for Naval Affairs Committee.

To Mr. FORD, for 1 month, on account of official business.

To Mr. POWERS, for 1 day, on account of official business.

To Mr. KEARNEY, for 10 days, on account of official business.

#### SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 134. An act for the relief of the heirs of John J. Shields;

S. 170. An act for the relief of W. Cooke;

S. 241. An act for the relief of Rachel Acerra;

S. 282. An act for the relief of Walter C. Blake;

S. 373. An act for the relief of Charles Favors;

S. 410. An act for the relief of James B. Lewis, Jarvis T. Mills, and Richard D. Peters;

S. 414. An act for the relief of Thaddeus C. Knight;

S. 510. An act for the relief of Inez Smith;

S. 516. An act for the relief of the Nashville, Chattanooga & St. Louis Railway;

S. 520. An act for the relief of Freddie Sanders and Edd Harris;

S. 625. An act for the relief of A. C. Blount and Oscar Williams;

S. 628. An act for the relief of Lawrence Anthony, R. E. Murphy, Mary E. Armstrong, and R. E. Murphy as administrator of the estate of Ella Murphy;

S. 671. An act for the relief of Charles Francis Fessenden;

S. 684. An act for the relief of Lt. M. V. Daven;

S. 695. An act for the relief of Joseph F. Bolger;

S. 717. An act for the relief of Cinda J. Short;

S. 743. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Walter H. Kindon;

S. 765. An act for the relief of Viola Dale;

S. 807. An act for the relief of Mary Frances Hutson;

S. 839. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Etta Houser Freeman;

S. 954. An act for the reimbursement of certain enlisted men of the Navy for personal

property lost in the loss of the *Hugh L. Scott*; and

S. 1025. An act for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States and for the settlement of individual claims approved by the War Department.

#### BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 131. An act to provide reemployment rights for persons who leave their positions to serve in the merchant marine, and for other purposes;

H. R. 575. An act for the relief of Peter Cuccio and Violet Cuccio;

H. R. 637. An act for the relief of Mrs. Eliza Ward;

H. R. 1278. An act for the relief of Dr. and Mrs. Richard Stever;

H. R. 1702. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Memphis, Tenn.;

H. R. 1731. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Louisiana to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Calcasieu River at or near Lake Charles, La.;

H. R. 1947. An act to extend the time within which a suit or suits may be brought under the act of June 28, 1938 (52 Stat. 1209);

H. R. 2077. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the St. Croix River at or near Hudson, Wis.;

H. R. 2427. An act to amend section 32 of the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933, as amended;

H. R. 2750. An act to amend section 353 (b) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended;

H. J. Res. 15. Joint resolution authorizing the appropriation of such sums as may be necessary to pay the proportionate share of the United States in the annual expenses of the Inter-American Financial and Economic Advisory Committee;

H. J. Res. 16. Joint resolution providing for participation by the United States in the Emergency Advisory Committee for Political Defense, and authorizing an appropriation therefor;

H. J. Res. 128. Joint resolution to authorize an appropriation for work relief in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands; and

H. J. Res. 136. Joint resolution making appropriations for advances to States for certain Federal grants for the first quarter of the fiscal year 1944.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 53 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Saturday, June 19, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### COMMITTEE HEARINGS

##### COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

Subcommittee No. 7 of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads will meet on Tuesday, June 22, 1943, at 10 a. m., for further consideration of bills relating to the carrying of mail on star routes. Public hearings will be held.

##### COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the subcommittee on investigation of restrictions on brand names and newsprint of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 2 p. m., Wednesday, June 23, 1943. Business to be considered: Open hearings, Office of Price Administration officials.

##### COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The subcommittee on unemployment insurance of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will consider in open hearings on Thursday, June 24, 1943, at 10 a. m., committee prints Nos. 1 and 2, dated June 7, 1943, relative to unemployment insurance for merchant seamen.

##### COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

The Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads will meet on Thursday, June 24, 1943, for the consideration of bill relating to leave of absence to postmasters, and bill amending the act fixing the hours of duty of postal employees. Public hearings will be held.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SNYDER: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 2996. A bill making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 566). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LANHAM: Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. H. R. 2975. A bill to increase by \$300,000,000 the amount authorized to be appropriated for defense housing under the act of October 14, 1940, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 567). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HERTER:

H. R. 2997. A bill to authorize the War Food Administrator to issue food stamps to be used to increase the food-purchasing power of low-income individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 2998. A bill to amend section 168 of the Criminal Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PAGÁN:

H. R. 3002. A bill to enable the people of Puerto Rico to form a constitution and State government and be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the States; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. WEST:

H. R. 3005. A bill to provide that the Alcoholic Beverage Control Board establish and maintain Government liquor stores in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. R. 2999. A bill for the relief of Leo Gullo; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MICHENER:

H. R. 3000. A bill for the relief of Clara E. Clark; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. NEWSOME:

H. R. 3001. A bill for the relief of James T. Rogers; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DAVIS:

H. R. 3003. A bill for the relief of Canal Dredging Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 3004. A bill to provide for the placing of the Reverend Connor B. Burns on the retired list of the Navy as a chaplain; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1604. By Mr. REED of Illinois: Petition of Agnes Plocher, R. F. D. No. 2, Aurora, Ill., and 29 citizens of Illinois, urging the passage of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of mobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1605. By Mr. ANDERSON of California: Petition of the Chamber of Commerce of the Pajaro Valley, at Watsonville, Calif., urging retention of Japanese in relocation centers; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

1606. By Mr. BRYSON: Petition of V. K. Beshgetor and 250 citizens of Alma, Mich., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1607. Also, petition of Elmer Moosberger and 20 citizens of Pontiac, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1608. Also, petition of William A. Allyn and 43 citizens of Holyoke, Mass., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1609. Also, petition of Ida Newton Black and 200 citizens of Los Angeles, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.



1610. Also, petition of Mrs. W. P. Pettigrew and 14 citizens of Starr, S. C., urging that the Farm Security Administration be continued under its present leadership and that funds for its operation be appropriated by Congress in an amount sufficient to extend its facilities to all farm families needing the kind of help which it provides; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1611. Also, petition of Elizabeth L. Roberts and 40 citizens of Hillits, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1612. Also, petition of Mrs. E. Lake and 12 citizens of Lake Worth, Fla., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1613. Also, petition of Olive N. Pettit and 25 citizens of Camp Hill, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1614. Also, petition of Mrs. O. A. Dahlgren and 20 citizens of Comstock, Nebr., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1615. Also, petition of Myrta S. Hopkins and 50 citizens of East Aurora, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1616. Also, petition of R. A. LeClere and 58 citizens of Winter Haven, Fla., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1617. Also, petition of Martha E. Washburn and 101 citizens of Miami, Fla., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1618. Also, petition of W. D. Boswell and 28 citizens of Waco, Tex., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1619. Also, petition of Rev. A. D. Oyer and 29 citizens of Gem, Kans., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1620. Also, petition of Cora M. Brunemeier and 40 citizens of Placentia, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1621. Also, petition of Lora M. Butzbach and 20 citizens of Anaheim, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1622. Also, petition of Mrs. L. J. Bain and 48 citizens of Capron, Va., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1623. Also, petition of Bertha Rolfe and 55 citizens of Santa Monica, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1624. Also, petition of Rev. Walter Thomas and 44 citizens of Marion, Ind., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1625. Also, petition of Mrs. John Roseman and 30 citizens of Willoughby, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1626. Also, petition of Mary B. Leiter and 40 citizens of Santa Barbara, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1627. Also, petition of Mrs. H. L. Parker and 20 citizens of Grove City, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the

duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1628. Also, petition of Mrs. T. M. Cochran and 80 citizens of Orange, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1629. Also, petition of Mrs. C. O. Gulleen and 127 citizens of Genoa, Nebr., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1630. Also, petition of Rosamond Davis and 60 citizens of Chicago, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1631. Also, petition of Mrs. G. P. Hill and 368 citizens of Santa Ana, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1632. Also, petition of Mabel Wood and 20 citizens of San Bernardino, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1633. Also, petition of John R. Lemons and 39 citizens of Los Angeles, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1634. Also, petition of Edith J. Denlinger and 97 citizens of Lemon Grove, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1635. Also, petition of Ida O. Meiser and 118 citizens of Pacific Palisades, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1636. Also, petition of Harriet S. Shannon and 67 citizens of Los Angeles, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the

manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1637. Also, petition of Sarah S. P. Stevens and 92 citizens of Newton Upper Falls, Mass., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1638. Also, petition of Mrs. J. H. Thompson and 71 citizens of Chula Vista, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1639. Also, petition of Eleanor M. Clark and 100 citizens of Ontario, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1640. Also, petition of Martha M. Gould and 17 citizens of Gorham, Maine, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1641. Also, petition of Barbara Allen and 21 citizens of Alta, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1642. Also, petition of Sara Graves Clark and 40 citizens of Lexington, Ky., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1643. Also, petition of Mrs. Scott Cabeen and 152 citizens of Seaton, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1644. Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union and 119 citizens of Chicago, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1645. Also, petition of 20 citizens of the State of Oregon sent in to Congressman LOWELL STOCKMAN, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the win-

ning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1646. Also, petition of Ida Newton Black and the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Los Angeles, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1647. Also, petition of Mrs. B. Frank Smith and 119 citizens of St. Petersburg, Fla., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1648. Also, petition of Mrs. Warren Enrich and 37 citizens of Ono, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1649. Also, petition of Minnie Dawley and 23 citizens of Forestville, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1650. Also, petition of Elsie Montgomery and 119 citizens of Fairview, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1651. Also, petition of Mrs. Walter Royal Jones and 21 citizens of Brooklyn, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1652. Also, petition of W. H. Brubaker and 40 citizens of Benson, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1653. Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union and 40 citizens of Chicago, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1654. Also, petition of Jennie E. Hovey and 88 citizens of South Fork, Mo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the man-

ufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1655. Also, petition of Elizabeth O. Cass and 70 citizens of Harvey, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1656. Also, petition of Mrs. A. E. Keenan and 20 citizens of Carlyle, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1657. Also, petition of T. J. Miller and 123 citizens of Holton, Kans., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1658. Also, petition of Arthur L. Shusser and 220 citizens of Freeport, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1659. Also, petition of Georgetta Stonecipher and 70 citizens of Streator, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1660. Also, petition of 312 citizens of Robinson, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1661. Also, petition of 916 citizens of Rockford, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1662. Also, petition of Mrs. Milton A. Slade and 40 citizens of Brooklyn, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1663. By Mr. GOODWIN: Petition of Alice M. Sweeney and 20 citizens of Everett and Malden, Mass., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war



and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1664. By Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN: Petition of 217 citizens of Renville County and surrounding territory in Minnesota, urging support of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1665. By Mr. JEFFREY: Petition of 85 citizens of Dayton, Ohio, urging support of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SATURDAY, JUNE 19, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Thou who dwellest in the heavens and earth, we praise Thee; Thou who holdest up the soul of our Nation and suffereth not its feet to be moved, we praise Thee; let all our people praise the countless manifestations of our infinitely holy Creator. They glow in the sunlight, breathe in the morning air, blossom in the landscape, gleam in the radiant sky, giving hope and comfort in the hours of sorrow and loneliness.

Holy, holy, is Thy name; how many joys, how many exquisite raptures and how many moments of deep tranquillity are inspired by Thee. We pray Thee to banish our doubts, conquer our fears, and let us never allow the clock of progress to be turned back. Blessed Lord, problems are asking for solution and may we declare to our country and world that we shall never permit the foundations of freedom to be vitiated. Set up in all hearts Thy reign of grace, quicken every pulse to aspire, and may we claim the divine right to live and be free. Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the Journal of the proceedings of yesterday.

The Clerk read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Journal will stand approved as read.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RABAUT. The Journal and the RECORD for yesterday are not in accord on the subsidy amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. I wish to make the parliamentary inquiry

to ask what could be done to have the two records in conformity?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. It is not necessary for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and the Journal to conform, because every Member has a right to revise and correct his remarks; but we go by the Journal of the House. As the Speaker very aptly and very wisely pointed out last night, it is the Journal that the Speaker has to go by, and that is what the House has to rely on.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. The Speaker is not bound by the Journal of the House and should not be bound by the Journal of the House until the Journal has been approved. The Journal represents the conclusion of the Journal Clerk as to what happened. On the other hand, the reporter's minutes are presumed to state correctly the words spoken in the Congress. Now, if there is a difference between the RECORD and the Journal—and I do not know whether there is or not—I do know that the Journal has no binding force or effect until it is approved by the House.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Of course, the Journal never has any binding effect until it is approved, and the House can repudiate the Journal or vote down a motion to approve the Journal of the previous day at any time. But I submit the Speaker was entirely correct yesterday in abiding by the Journal as it then stood and as it stands now.

Mr. RABAUT. That I may be correctly understood, anything I may say here is not in any way applying to the Speaker of the House. I have the greatest respect for the Speaker, as everybody in this body knows; but yesterday we had a request for a vote by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], as is exemplified in the RECORD on page 6140. It calls for a separate vote on three amendments offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. On one of those amendments the House has never voted. It has not been voted en grosse, because there is a record here that a separate vote was requested. So it could not have been voted on en grosse. Evidently that part of the bill has never been passed. That is the point I am making. Does the House want to leave it in that condition or does the House desire to correct it? That is the only question I am asking.

Mr. RANKIN. I will say to the gentleman that the Speaker was listening rather attentively when the request was made, and of all people who listen most attentively it is those charged with the responsibility of making up the Journal. The Speaker understood that there was no request for a vote on that amendment, and the Journal showed it. So, of course, as far as adopting the Journal is concerned, that is a question for the

House at all times, but up to the present time I submit that the Speaker was entirely correct in his ruling on yesterday, that according to the Journal and according to his memory this amendment had been voted on.

Mr. RABAUT. The Speaker last night, as recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, said—and I have no quarrel with the Speaker, and I want everybody to know that—but the Speaker last night said that the particular part of the stenographer's notes was not available at the time when the question was brought up. That is in the RECORD. Mistakes can happen any place. We are all human beings. All I want to know is whether the House wants to leave the two records at variance as they are, and show that we never voted on subsidies.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman knows it has been adopted.

Mr. RABAUT. It could not have been adopted.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It was adopted en grosse with the other amendments.

Mr. RABAUT. It could not have been adopted in any manner, shape, or form, because we did not vote on it en grosse as a request for a separate vote is recorded in the RECORD.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The Journal shows otherwise, with all due respect to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. Well, I am reading from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 18, page 6140.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I call for the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the approval of the Journal.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, if the House wishes this discrepancy to stand, I withdraw my objection.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, under the right to object—

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I have called for the regular order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the approval of the Journal of yesterday.

The motion was agreed to; and the Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was approved.

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill and a concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 2556. An act for the relief of Burton S. Radford; and

H. Con. Res. 28. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of the manuscript entitled "Questions and Answers on the Current Tax Payment Act of 1943," as a House document, and providing for the printing of additional copies thereof for the use of the House and Senate document rooms.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 27. An act to provide for suspending the enforcement of certain obligations against